

Sanctification in the Jesus Tradition

It is generally accepted that holiness is a central issue in the Old Testament. According to the Exodus tradition, God has chosen Israel for himself to be a holy people. He has led the people out of Egypt and into the holy land, and — closely connected with entry into the promised land — given them the sanctuary in Jerusalem to maintain their holiness. As God's people they are called to live holy lives which express God's holy will. The prophets expect that in the kingdom of God or the Messiah, for that matter, God's all pervasive holiness will overcome the distinction between the holy and the profane (Zech 14,20-21; cf. Isa 4,3; Ezek 36 and 37). According to Zeph 3,9, even Gentiles will participate in that universal sanctification⁽¹⁾.

In Paul, the issue of holiness and sanctification is even more prominent than that of justification. In fact, the respective terminology occurs in every single letter, except Galatians.

But in the synoptic tradition about Jesus, this whole terminology is conspicuous by its absence. Apart from a few instances where it is used in a rather more traditional way — in expressions like "the holy Spirit", "the holy city", "the holy angels" — Jesus hardly ever seems to talk about holiness or sanctification. As a consequence, John Riches in his article on holiness concludes, that Jesus consciously eschews the terminology of holiness and sanctification. According to Riches this terminology was re-introduced in later parts of the christian tradition by the Hellenistic Jewish christians who initially spread the teaching of Jesus⁽²⁾.

These observations, valid as they may be, require supplementation. Jesus does speak about holiness and sanctification in a very prominent place, namely in the opening petition of the Lord's Prayer: "hallowed be your name" (Matt 6,9 par. Luke 11,2), which Riches only mentions in passing. In this petition the whole notion of holiness as it is presented in the Old Testament is taken up and placed right at the centre of Jesus' message⁽³⁾.

(1) Cf. Jub 4,26, which envisages "the sanctification of the earth ... from all impurity and sin"; for the opposite view see syrBar 98,4-5.

(2) Cf. J. RICHES, "Heiligung", *TRE* XIV, 718-737, 720.

(3) According to N.T. WRIGHT, "The Lord's Prayer as a Paradigm of Christian

In all extant versions of the Lord's Prayer (i.e., Matthew, Luke, Didache) the wording of the opening petition is: "Hallowed be your name". The meaning of this petition is not to be restricted either to an ethical or an eschatological sense⁽⁴⁾.

To sanctify God's name means, first of all, to perceive in ultimate reverence and fear God revealing himself⁽⁵⁾. According to Lev 19,2 parr. this recognition of the holy God must lead to a holy life.

The expression "to sanctify God's name" occurs only in Ezekiel 36 and 44(,41.44), in Lev 22,32 and Isa 29,23. In Ezek 36,22-32 God promises that his name will be sanctified as a result of the eschatological action of the Holy Spirit⁽⁶⁾. God himself will sanctify his name before the nations (36,23) by gathering his people from the nations (36,24), purifying them from impurity and idolatry (36,25), giving them a new heart and a new spirit (36,26), leading them to obedience through the Holy Spirit (36,27), and by re-establishing them in the land (36,28a). Then they will experience the reality the covenant formula describes: "You shall be my people, and I will be your God" (36,28b; 37,27), and will be sanctified once more (37,28).

It follows that the petition "hallowed be your name" implies nothing less than the recreation or restitution of Israel as a holy people in fulfilment of this prophecy. For, not only in Ezek 36, but in all other instances where the formula of sanctifying God's name occurs in the Old Testament, there is a firm connection between the sanctification of God's name and the restitution (or — in the case of Lev 22 — the institution) of his people. This restitution implies renewal of (in the

Prayer", *Into God's Presence*. Prayer in the New Testament (ed. R.N. LONGENECKER) (Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, U. K. 2001) 147, the Lord's Prayer is "the heart of the New Covenant Charter".

⁽⁴⁾ H. GESE, "Bemerkungen zum Vaterunser unter dem Gesichtspunkt alttestamentlicher Gebetsformen", *Jesus Christus als die Mitte der Schrift* (ed. C. LANDMESSER) (BZNW 86; Berlin – New York 1997) 427; cf. G. STRECKER, "Vaterunser und Glaube", *Glaube im Neuen Testament*. Festschrift für H. Binder zum 70. Geb. (ed. F. HAHN – H. KLEIN) (Biblisch-theologische Studien 7; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1982) 22. According to O. CULLMANN, *Salvation in History* (New Testament Library; London 1967) 166 the "tension between 'Already' and 'Not yet'" is "a key to the understanding of the New Testament salvation history".

⁽⁵⁾ Cf. GESE, "Vaterunser", 427.

⁽⁶⁾ Cf. P. STUHLMACHER, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen ²1997) I, 87; G. LOHFINK, *Wie hat Jesus Gemeinde gewollt?* (Freiburg im Breisgau 1993) 26-27; J.A. FITZMYER, *Luke*. Introduction, translation, and notes (AB 28; Garden City 1985) II, 898.

case of Lev 22: a call to) the sanctification of God's name by obedience⁽⁷⁾, just as God's name is desecrated by the disobedience of his People: cf. Lev 18,21; 19,12; 22,32; Jer 34,16; Amos 2,7 and others.

All interpreters do not consent to this interpretation of the opening petition of the Lord's Prayer. However, I would like to show that the reality to which this petition points, is a governing principle underlying Jesus' entire ministry. Through his coming the eschatological restoration of the people of God as it is promised in Ezekiel 36 has already begun, just as the kingdom of God mentioned in the second petition of the Lord's prayer, has already broken in (Luke 11,20 and 17,21 par. Matt 12,28 define in which respect the Kingdom of God is present in his own ministry). Jesus takes up the teaching and promises of the prophets, but at the same time goes beyond them by claiming that through his coming the reality to which they prophesied is now being fulfilled. The prophetic-messianic understanding of sanctification that this entails, can be traced throughout all the different layers of the synoptic gospel tradition. It finds its expression in statements about 1) Jesus' own holiness, 2) the beginning of the gathering of the people of God, 3) the cleansing of the people of God, 4) the Holy Spirit, 5) the demand of unconditional obedience towards the will of God, 6) Jesus' attitude towards the Temple cult.

1. *Jesus' Own Holiness*

According to Luke Jesus is called "holy" because he was begotten by the Holy Spirit (1,35). He is introduced as "full of the Holy Spirit" from the very beginning of his ministry (cf. Luke 4,1.14.18 to Isa 61,1; cf. also Mark 1,10 par.).

In the gospel of Mark, he is called "the Holy one of God" in the passage about the demon possessed man at Capernaum in Mark 1,21-28 (par. Luke 4,31-37). As "the Holy One of God" he has authority over the unclean spirits. This authority indicates that in him the kingdom of God is at hand (Luke 11,20)⁽⁸⁾. The fact that the author of the fourth gospel and Luke in Acts 2,25 could use "the Holy One of God" as a designation of the Messiah, suggests that they knew it to have messianic connotation, even though the respective traditions are not accessible to us any more.

⁽⁷⁾ LOHFINK, *Gemeinde*, 27.

⁽⁸⁾ According to AssMos 10,1 the end of Satan coincides with the beginning of the reign of God.

In his lament over Jerusalem (Matt 23,7-39 par. Luke 13,34-35) Jesus compares himself to a “hen gathering her brood under her wings”. This image of the mother bird can be understood if we think of the wings of the cherubs above the ark of the covenant as the place of God’s indwelling and of atonement in the priestly code. Jesus thus identifies with the divine *shekhinah* dwelling in the Temple at Jerusalem⁽⁹⁾.

Matthew especially emphasizes that Jesus takes the place of the Temple as a place of meeting with God by introducing him as “Immanuel” in the first chapter of his gospel (1,23). In him, “something greater than the Temple is here” (Matt 12,6). In him the very holiness of God has come to his people.

In the Synoptics then, Jesus figures as the Messiah who has been sanctified by and for God, the Holy One par excellence (cf. Mark 1,24; Luke 1,35; Acts 3,14; 4,27.30; using *hosios*: 3,11; 5,7). He is filled with the Holy Spirit, and in him God’s holiness is at work among his people. This is in keeping with Ezekiel 37, where a new David will be God’s agent in sanctifying his people (cf. 37,24 to 37,28).

2. *The Beginning of the Gathering of the People of God*

As God’s Messiah Jesus has “to gather a holy people, whom he will lead in righteousness” (PsSol 17,26). The fact that he called a circle of 12 disciples (Mark 3,13-19 par; cf. Acts 1,26; 1 Cor 15,5) is to be interpreted as an expression of his claim to reconstitute the twelve tribes of Israel. In the gospel of Luke, even the hymns in the opening chapters point to the restitution of Israel through Jesus. In an elaborate composition of Old Testament quotations, the Magnificat depicts his mission as the fulfilment of the promises to Israel (cf. especially 1,54)⁽¹⁰⁾. The Benedictus shows how the Messiah gathers a people who will serve God “without fear, in holiness and righteousness” (1,74-75). According to Luke 12,32, Jesus called his disciples the “little flock” to whom God will give the kingdom, thus designating them as the core of the eschatological people of “the holy ones of the Most High”, to whom the kingdom is given in Dan 7,18.27. According to Luke 22,28-30, he appointed them as judges over the 12 tribes of Israel, which again is in keeping with Dan 7,22 (LXX).

⁽⁹⁾ H. GESE, *Alttestamentliche Studien* (Tübingen 1990) 237.

⁽¹⁰⁾ For a detailed exegesis of the Magnificat and the Benedictus, see U. MITTMANN-RICHTER, *Magnifikat und Benedictus* (WUNT 90; Tübingen 1996).

The 12 and those around them are not a substitute of, or a sect within, Israel. Jesus adheres to his claim to the whole of Israel, even when the majority of Israel rejects him. He finally gives his life for “the many” (cf. Mark 10,45; 14,24 to Isa 53,11), thus making repentance possible for all once more. However, it cannot be denied that there are certain features of the idea of a remnant in the Jesus tradition: because Jesus meets growing rejection in Israel, for a time the majority of Israel is no longer reckoned as Israel. This becomes evident in the announcement of judgement on Chorazin and Bethsaida in Matt 11,20-24 par. Luke 10,13-15 as well as in the parable of the tenants (Mark 12,1-9)⁽¹¹⁾. The latter pronounces a threat of judgement against those in Israel who reject Jesus, thus putting themselves outside Israel. At the same time, it indicates that Gentiles will participate in Israel’s salvation as it is brought about by Jesus.

Participation in the kingdom now depends on faith and adherence to Jesus. To those who adhere to him, Jesus applies the Old Testament designation οἱ ἐκλεκτοί (Mark 13,20.22.27 par. Matt 24,22.24.31). This is corroborated by the parable of the wedding feast (Matt 22,1-10 par. Luke 14,15-24), where the right attitude towards Jesus and his message is decisive for belonging to the people of God gathered by Jesus⁽¹²⁾.

According to Matthew, Jesus told his disciples explicitly “to go nowhere among the Gentiles and to enter no town of the Samaritans, but to go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel” (10,5-6). This makes it plain that their task is the restoration of Israel. By going to Syrophoenicia and the Decapolis, which, according to the Old Testament and early Judaism, belong to greater Israel, Jesus symbolically indicated his intention to restore greater Israel⁽¹³⁾. The harsh rebuff of the Syrophoenician gentile woman (Mark 7,27 par. Matt 15,26) confirms that he intended to restore Israel as a holy people. However, in the same way as the healing in the Decapolis,

⁽¹¹⁾ R. PESCH, *Markusevangelium* (HTKNT 2; Freiburg im Breisgau 1977) II, 221, has pointed out convincingly that there is no reason why this parable should not go back to Jesus himself.

⁽¹²⁾ The criterion of adherence to the messiah is new but not alien to Judaism in that God had promised long ago to send Israel a “shepherd”, his servant “David” (cf. Jer 23,5-6; Ezek 34,23-24). His task is to act on God’s behalf (cf. Ezek 34,23 with 34,11). It is clear that when he comes, obedience to God necessarily implies adherence to him.

⁽¹³⁾ Cf. M. BOCKMUEHL, *Jewish Law in Gentile Churches*. Halakhah and the Beginning of Christian Public Ethics (Edinburgh 2000) 76.

which follows immediately, it demonstrates that where people put their trust in Jesus this holy people could transcend the limits of Israel (Mark 7,29). The impurity of that gentile woman is not an issue for Jesus. The same attitude is at the heart of Jesus' intention to enter a village of the Samaritans (Luke 9,52-56). Again, Samaria was not simply gentile territory; it was "part of the idealized dimensions of the biblical Holy Land as assigned to the nine-and-a-half lost tribes" ⁽¹⁴⁾. Yet pious Jews normally shunned it for purity reasons. Jesus, however, regardless of purity matters, symbolically went to restore it as a part of Israel.

Jesus' announcement that he would go to Galilee after his resurrection (Mark 14,27-28 par. Matt 26,31; see Mark 16,7 par. Matt 28,7; cf. Luke 24,6) also symbolizes the completion of the messianic gathering of Israel. In order to fully comprehend the significance of this announcement, one has to take into consideration the quotation from Zech 13,7-8 in Mark 14,27. Zech 13,7 speaks of the death of the messianic shepherd of Israel and of the extirpation of two thirds of the people. After that a remnant of the people will be saved and re-established as people of God (Zech 13,8-9). In this context, Galilee stands for the no longer existing Northern kingdom of Israel, which, according to the prophets (Ezek 37,15-28; cf. Jer 30,1-31,40; Hos 11,8-9) had to be re-united with the South in order for Israel to be restored. By quoting Zech 13,7 before he went to Galilee, Jesus indicated that he was about to fulfil the expectation of the restitution of Israel after judgement on the shepherd and his flock ⁽¹⁵⁾.

After the resurrection of Jesus, however, the limitation to Israel no longer applies. Now the disciples are sent to "all nations". However, "for the sake of their new, world-wide mission the disciples are not to stop going through the cities of Israel, which Jesus had made their duty in Matt 10,5-6. It is not an oversight that Matthew does not report a return of the disciples during Jesus' lifetime ..." ⁽¹⁶⁾. By their mission to the Gentiles they are setting "into play the pilgrimage of the nations to

⁽¹⁴⁾ Ibid.

⁽¹⁵⁾ H. Gese pointed this out in a senior seminar in Tübingen in 1997. See the short remark in his article "The Messiah", 151 and the more extensive presentation in P. STUHLMACHER, "Matt 28:16-20 and the Course of Mission in the Apostolic and Postapostolic Age", *The Mission of the Early Church to Jews and Gentiles* (ed. J. ÅDNA) (WUNT 127; Tübingen 2000) 24-27; similarly D. WENHAM, *Paul. Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?* (Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, U.K. 1995) 177f.

⁽¹⁶⁾ STUHLMACHER, "The Course of Mission", 30.

Zion which Jesus had looked ahead to (cf. Matt 8,11-12 with Isa 25, 6-9)"⁽¹⁷⁾.

The Gospel of Luke emphasizes especially that the people of the elect (18,7) will consist of Jews and Gentiles (24,47; cf. Mark 13,10 par. Matt 24,18), with Jerusalem at its centre (24,49.53). The mission of Jesus is regarded as the eschatological fulfilment of the calling of Israel, which from the promise to Abraham on included the Gentiles (cf. Gen 12,3; Isa 49,6)⁽¹⁸⁾. J. Jervell has underlined in several contributions on this subject, that God has only one people, namely Israel. The church therefore, "is the beginning of "the restored Israel"⁽¹⁹⁾.

Not only Gentiles, but also Jews who had hitherto been excluded from the people of God, become part of the eschatological people of God. All three synoptic gospels have Jesus dine with sinners and tax-collectors. This leads us to our third point:

3. *The Cleansing of the People of God*

According to Ezekiel 36, God's sanctifying action will entail the cleansing of his people from all their impurities (36,25.29) and from all their sins (36,33). Both elements feature in Jesus' ministry.

a) Cleansing people from their impurities

Jesus drives out demons and heals the sick (Mark 1,32-34.39 parr.; Mark 6,53-56 par. Matt 14,34-36; Matt 12,28 par. Luke 11,20 and others), cleanses lepers (Mark 1,40-45 parr.; Luke 17,11-19), heals a woman with a blood discharge (Mark 5,25-34 parr.) and raises the dead (Mark 5,35-43 parr.; Luke 7,11-17; cf. John 11,39-44). Demons, scale disease, continuous blood discharges and death, all involved severe impurity and therefore excluded the people concerned from Israel. By cleansing and healing the sick, Jesus overcomes what separates them from God and reintegrates them in the holy people of God.

In contemporary Judaism as well as in the Old Testament, impure

⁽¹⁷⁾ Ibid.

⁽¹⁸⁾ For the significance of Gen 12,1-3 as "a preface to a larger story of salvation which reaches beyond Israel (yet through Israel) to the gentiles" see J.B. WELLS, *God's Holy People. A Theme in Biblical Theology* (JSOTSS 305; Sheffield 2000) 206.

⁽¹⁹⁾ J. JERVELL, *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles* (New Testament Theology; Cambridge 1996) 43 and 118.

people were looked upon as a danger to other people's purity, since their impurity was considered contagious (cf. Lev 13,45-46; 15,25; 21,11). Jesus, however, heals impure people by touching them. Examples of this are the healing of the leper (Mark 1,41 parr.), the healing of a woman suffering from a blood discharge who touched him (Mark 5,25-34 parr.), the resurrection of the daughter of Jairus, whom Jesus seized by her hand (Mark 5,41 parr.), and of the young man at Nain, whose bier Jesus "touched" (Luke 7,14). Jesus' lack of concern in dealing with these impure people is certainly not the norm in his day⁽²⁰⁾. If Jesus can heal the impure by touching them, his holiness must be "transferable"⁽²¹⁾.

In the OT there are very few instances where holiness is considered transferable. According to P, holiness can only be transferred to things, not to people (Exod 29,37; 30,26-29; Lev 6,11.20). Ezekiel takes up the older view (cf. 2 Sam 6,6-7), according to which the holiness of holy items in the temple can be transmitted to people (Ezek 42,14; 44,19; 46,20). Such transmission can have lethal consequences (Num 4,15) and must be avoided. Haggai and the Tannaites, finally, reduce the transmission of holiness to food (Hag 2,10-12)⁽²²⁾. In general, according to the Old Testament, it is the impure which contaminates the Holy. The contagious character of holiness is therefore not a general principle. Jesus does not say that holiness always transfers itself. Rather, through him and in him, the Holy One of God, God's holiness has come. His transferable holiness destroys the impurity so that it no longer has the capacity to render others impure⁽²³⁾. Those he touches he restores to communion with God. This

⁽²⁰⁾ The gospels do not tell whether Jesus underwent the prescribed rites of purification after touching those people. We therefore cannot know whether or not these healings by touch involved a transgression of the law. In view of the complicated rites of purification the law prescribed for such cases and the long-term impurity one incurred by touching a corpse, as well as in view of the danger of death if one failed to undergo the appropriate rites (Num 19,13.20), Jesus' behaviour is at least remarkable (cf. J.D.G. DUNN, "Jesus and Purity. An Ongoing Debate", *NTS* 48 [2002], 465).

⁽²¹⁾ In the Old Testament, only impurity and holiness are "active" in the sense that they can expand their realms; purity and profanity are passive. They do not expand.

⁽²²⁾ Cf. J. MILGROM, *Leviticus 1-16. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3; New York 1991) 443-456.

⁽²³⁾ Cf. K. BERGER, "Von der notwendigen Unterscheidung des Heiligen und des Unheiligen", *Heilige(s) für Protestanten* (ed. R. EHMANN) (Herrenalber Forum 7; Karlsruhe 1993) 48-49.

goes far beyond even Ezekiel's concept of contagious holiness. It is the fulfilment of the eschatological victory of the holy over the unholy as it is envisaged in Zech 14,20.

This is in agreement with the view that the healings Jesus performs are messianic signs, which becomes evident in Matt 11,5 (par. Luke 7,22; cf. 4Q521 frg. 2, which applies Isa 29,18; 35,5-6; 26,19; 61,1-2 to the messiah, thus bearing witness to the expectation that the messiah will heal the sick). The synoptics stress that Jesus heals in messianic authority by reporting that the sick turned to him as the "Son of David" (Mark 10,47 parr.; Matt 9,27; 15,22; 20,31). In healing those whom the law would have expelled, Jesus indicates that he has come to fulfil the Torah with messianic authority. The Torah expelled the impure in order to witness to God as the God of life, wholeness and purity. Jesus witnessed to the same God by healing people, thus fulfilling the ultimate purpose of the Torah⁽²⁴⁾.

It is therefore too weak to say that "Jesus was evidently remembered as one who sat loose to many of the purity restrictions, which regulated social behaviour", as J.D.G. Dunn⁽²⁵⁾ puts it. Jesus' actions are an immediate implication of his "prophetic-messianic" understanding of holiness. He took up the concept of holiness the Old Testament prophets had represented but claimed that the messianic time they had been looking forward to had dawned in his own coming. On the one hand people often take him to be a prophet (cf. Mark 6,15 par. Luke 9,8; Matt 8,28 parr.; Matt 21,11 and Luke 7,16). Jesus never refutes this identification (cf. Luke 24,19, especially). He can even compare himself to the prophets (Mark 6,4 parr. and Luke 13,33). On the other hand, he leaves no doubt that in him there is "more than Jonah" (Matt 12,41 par. Luke 11,32) and that he surpasses the prophets⁽²⁶⁾. Jesus claims that in order to perceive the whole truth about him, one must go on from the prophets and recognize that in him the messianic age they had announced has come (Mark 8,29 parr. and Mark 14,61-62 par. Matt 26,63-64).

⁽²⁴⁾ Cf. G. WENHAM, "Christ's Healing Ministry", *Studies in Christology*. Presented to D. Guthrie (ed. H.H. ROWDON) (London 1982) 125.

⁽²⁵⁾ "Jesus and Holiness", *Holiness. Past & Present* (ed. S.C. BARTON) (London – New York 2003) 187.

⁽²⁶⁾ Cf. J. SCHNIEWIND, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (NTD 2; Göttingen 1977) 163; J. ÅDNA, *Jesu Ställning zum Tempel*. Die Tempelaktion und das Tempelwort als Ausdruck seiner messianischen Sendung (WUNT 119; Tübingen 2000) 439, n. 21.

b) Cleansing from Sin

Ezekiel also promised that God would cleanse his people from their sins. Jesus' intention to cleanse God's people from sin becomes apparent in his call to repentance (Mark 1,14-15; cf. the call to individuals to follow him and to serve in the kingdom of God in Mark 1,17.20; 2,14; 3,13; 8,34). According to the Gospel of Luke, Peter, when called by Jesus, recognizes his own sinfulness in the presence of Jesus' holiness (5,8). It follows that his call to discipleship involved an act of forgiveness⁽²⁷⁾. To the sinful woman who touches him, Jesus also grants the forgiveness of her sins (Luke 7,36-50). At the end of the story about Levi, Jesus states that he has come "to call sinners" (Mark 2,17 par.). In Matthew and Luke the parables of the lost sheep (Matt 18,12-14 par. Luke 15,3-7), the lost coin (Luke 15,8-10) and the prodigal son (Luke 15,11-32), as well as the account about Zacchaeus (Luke 19,1-10) all demonstrate that Jesus had come "to seek and to save the lost", namely sinners (cf. Matt 18,13 to Luke 15,7; Luke 19,10). He was looked upon as "a friend of tax collectors and sinners" (Matt 11,19 par. Luke 7,34). He sanctified people by having table fellowship with them, thereby bringing them back into communion with God (Mark 2,14-17 par.)⁽²⁸⁾. In the opinion of the Pharisees Jesus defiles himself by having table fellowship with impure sinners (cf. Luke 7,39 with regard to the defiling effect of the touch of sinners)⁽²⁹⁾. More importantly, by doing so he seems to approve of their transgressions of the law. He, however, claims that he can forgive

⁽²⁷⁾ Cf. I.H. MARSHALL, *Kept by the Power of God* (Worcester – London 1969) 37, 42.

⁽²⁸⁾ On the significance of Jesus' table fellowship with sinners cf. O. HOFIUS, *Neutestamentliche Studien* (WUNT 132; Tübingen 2000) 29-33.

⁽²⁹⁾ Cf. DUNN, "Jesus and Holiness", 185. J. KLAUANS states repeatedly that sinners are not ritually impure and that therefore contact with sinners does not endanger one's ritual purity (cf. *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* [Oxford 2000] 137). However, S. WESTERHOLM "Clean and Unclean", *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (ed. J.B. GREEN – S. MCKNIGHT) (Downers Grove, IL. – Leicester, U.K. 1992) 131, correctly points out that even though "the attacks on Jesus' association with sinners are not based on considerations of purity", "it is self-evident that no one eating meals in such company could share the vision of those dedicated to preserve ritual purity at their meals". Cf. HOFIUS, *Neutestamentliche Studien*, 28 (translation mine): "If the Pharisees refused to share a meal with someone who was not educated in the law, table fellowship with sinners would have been beyond question" (cf. Hofius' reference to *mDem* 2,3; *bBer* 43b *baraita*; *bSanh* 23a *ibid.* 27, n. 43 and 44).

sins in God's authority (Mark 2,5.7.9 par. Matt 9,2.5 par. Luke 5,20,21,23)⁽³⁰⁾.

All these examples demonstrate that Jesus purified the eschatological people of God from their sins and called them to obedience to the will of God. He sealed his claim to forgive sins by his atoning death, which was "for the forgiveness of sins", as Matthew states explicitly (26,28).

4. *References to the Holy Spirit*

An integral part of the eschatological sanctification of Israel according to Ezekiel was the outpouring of the Spirit. The early church was aware that he had not yet been poured out on the disciples during the earthly life of Jesus. Accordingly, references to the Holy Spirit in the gospels are sparse. However, Jesus is anointed with the Spirit at his baptism (Mark 1,10 parr.); he is led by the Spirit from the very beginning of his ministry (Mark 1,12 parr.). John the Baptist announces him as the one who "will baptize with the Holy Spirit" (Mark 1,8.10 par. Matt 3,11 par. Luke 3,16). This indicates the expectation that Jesus' ministry would somehow bring about the pouring out of the Holy Spirit as it is promised in Ezekiel 36. Beyond that, the Synoptics show that Jesus worked in the power of the Holy Spirit in his earthly ministry. He claimed to drive out demons by his power (cf. Matt 12,28 to Mark 3,29)⁽³¹⁾, thus proving to be "the stronger one" John had announced, who is even stronger than Satan (Mark 3,22-29 par. Matt 12,22-30; cf. Luke 11,15-22), and who is to baptize with the Spirit (Mark 1,7-8 parr.)⁽³²⁾. The fact that the disciples participate in Jesus' ministry of exorcism (cf. Mark 6,7 par. Matt 10,1 par. Luke 9,1) implies that they, too, work in the power of the Spirit. However, the incident

⁽³⁰⁾ On the forgiveness of sins by Jesus and its denial in research cf. C.-H. SUNG, *Vergebung der Sünden* (WUNT 57; Tübingen 1993) 186-191, 282-284 and HOFIUS, *Neutestamentliche Studien*, 38-56. C.-H. Sung concludes that the forgiveness of sins was at the core of Jesus' ministry (*ibid.*, 283).

⁽³¹⁾ According to J.E. Yates, Mark 3,22-27 and 3,28-30 belong together (J.E. YATES, *The Spirit and the Kingdom* [London 1963] 85-89).

⁽³²⁾ For this and the following paragraph I am indebted to M. Hooker, who drew my attention to the ongoing presence of the Spirit in the life of Jesus. According to J. E. Yates, Matthew and Mark agree with respect to the meaning of the term "Holy Spirit": "It bears the meaning of 'God's actual presence and activity' among men", and expresses the *datum* which is expressed or implied at every turn in the words and deeds of Jesus" (*The Spirit*, 179).

where they fail to do so (Mark 9,14-29 parr.), which has no parallel after Pentecost, shows that they do not share in his power without reservation. With respect to the future, Jesus promises that his disciples will bear witness to him in the power of the Holy Spirit (Mark 13,11 par. Matt 10,20 par. Luke 12,12).

The Gospel of Luke contains further references to the Holy Spirit. Jesus is “full of the Holy Spirit” from the beginning of his ministry on (Luke 4,1.14), and introduces himself in the Synagogue at Nazareth by reading Is 61,1-2 [LXX]: πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ’ ἐμέ ... The following verses describe the ministry this entails: “to proclaim good news to the poor, to proclaim liberty to the captives and to recover sight to the blind, to set at liberty those who are oppressed, to proclaim the year of the Lord’s favour” (cf. Luke 4,18-19). Jesus claims that this word of Scripture is being fulfilled “today” (4,21). When John sends his disciples to ask whether Jesus is the one he announced (Luke 7,18-23 par. Matt 11,2-10), i.e., the one who will baptize with the Holy Spirit (cf. Luke 3,16), Jesus has already carried out all that this prophecy implies (cf. especially Luke 7,21). This means that his entire ministry can be understood as baptism with the Holy Spirit. Jesus proclaims that those who ask God will receive the Spirit (Luke 11,13). At the end of his ministry, according to Luke, he promises the coming of the Spirit as “power from on high” (24,49). Within Luke-Acts this refers to the pouring out of the Spirit on Pentecost and its effects. At Pentecost the disciples receive a full share of the power of the Spirit, in which Jesus had worked on earth.

According to Matthew, those who believed were to be baptized “in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit” (Matt 28,19). This indicates that at baptism the Gentiles who became disciples were given the eschatological gift of the Spirit (cf. Joel 3,1-2 and Ezek 36,27).

5. The Call to Unconditional Obedience Towards the Will of God

Crucial to the restoration of God’s people according to Ezekiel 36 is, that the Spirit will lead them to obedience: “I will put my spirit within you, and make you follow my statutes and be careful to observe my ordinances” (v. 27). Jesus not only cleansed the people he gathered, but he also held them to unconditional obedience towards the will of God. In the Old Testament, sanctification always entailed observance of ritual Torah and ethical Torah. When we come to the Jesus tradition, we find a significant change in this respect.

a) Sanctification Defined in Terms of Love and Mercy

If we do not interpret the transfiguration story (Mark 9,2-10 parr.) as a “misplaced Easter story”, but with H. Gese read it “through the eyes of the Old Testament”, it becomes obvious that it is shaped after the pattern of the revelation to Moses on Mount Sinai⁽³³⁾. The important difference between the two accounts is that at Mount Sinai “God revealed himself in the formula of self-introduction, ‘I am Yahweh,’ and then he gave the Decalogue. Here, however, God introduces his son, ‘This is my beloved Son,’ and then continues, ‘listen to him’ ”⁽³⁴⁾. The command “listen to him” is an allusion to Deut 18,15, designating Jesus as the messianic prophet like Moses. His instruction is to be seen on a level with God’s commandments. His words, like God’s word, “will not pass away” (Mark 13,31). In his antitheses, Jesus in his messianic authority enforces the will of God unconditionally, thus bringing God’s law and its interpretation by the prophets to completion (Matt 5,17; cf. 7,12b)⁽³⁵⁾. According to Matthew, Jesus obliges those who would come to him to keep his Torah (11,29-30).

At the core of Jesus’ teaching on the will of God we find the double commandment to love both God and neighbour unconditionally (Mark 12,28-34 parr.)⁽³⁶⁾. Jesus approved of the scribe’s reply that loving God and one’s neighbour “is much more than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices” (Mark 12,33). This statement is not necessarily to be taken as a rejection of sacrifice and cult. It does, however, give preference to ethical holiness.

Besides love the motif of mercy plays an important part in both Luke and Matthew. Human beings are expected to treat their fellow humans with the same mercy that they receive from God. This mercy culminates in love for one’s enemy (Luke 6,27) and is to distinguish Jesus’ disciples from “sinners” (6,32-35). The “good Samaritan” is driven by compassion to love his neighbour (10,33), while the two representatives of the cult, a priest and a Levite, evade this ethical obligation on the pretext of their cultic duties and the purity they wish to maintain (Luke 10,25-37)⁽³⁷⁾. Jesus commands those who have

⁽³³⁾ *Essays on Biblical Theology* (Minneapolis 1981) 88.

⁽³⁴⁾ GESE, *Essays on Biblical Theology*, 89.

⁽³⁵⁾ STUHLMACHER, *Biblische Theologie*, I, 104.

⁽³⁶⁾ Paul followed him in this: cf. Rom 13,8-10; Gal 5,14.

⁽³⁷⁾ Cf. the interpretation of R. BAUCKHAM, “The Scrupulous Priest and the Good Samaritan. Jesus’ Parabolic Interpretation of the Law of Moses”, *NTS* 44 (1998) 475-489.

received mercy, to pass it on (Matt 18,27.33). Sin and impurity can no longer exclude people from the kingdom of God, since Jesus forgives sins and overcomes impurity. What does exclude from the kingdom, however, is the refusal to pass on to one's neighbour the mercy which one has received from God. This is shown in the parable of the unforgiving servant (Matt 18,21-22.34-35; cf. 6,12). As a consequence, the real threat to holiness is now unmercifulness, whereas cultic impurity no longer constitutes such a threat.

That for Jesus love and mercy are the true meaning of holiness is proved by the recasting of the Lev 19,2 parr. formula, which challenges Israel to emulate God's holiness. Instead of "Be holy, for I, the Lord, your God, am holy", according to Luke, it now runs: "Be merciful, just as your Father is merciful". In Matthew it says: "Be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect". In the context of both Matthew 5 and Luke 6 this is illustrated by the commandment to love one's enemies. Jesus replaces "being holy" by love for one's enemy, and mercy as the essence of sanctification or of any true imitation of God.

What place, then, does the purity Torah occupy in Jesus' concept of sanctification?

b) Purity Torah

In the light of Jesus' extensive teaching on ethics, it is remarkable that the synoptics do not transmit a single saying where Jesus confirms the importance of the ritual Torah. Of course, the gospels contain hints which show that he did observe it on occasion. For example, he tells the lepers he has cleansed "to show themselves to the priests" and bring the sacrifice required in such a case (cf. Mark 1,40-45 parr.; Luke 17,12-19 to Lev 13-14), even though the phrase "for a proof to them" (Mark 1,44 parr.) may well express a certain reserve as to the use of such practice⁽³⁸⁾. But we never find him advocating issues of ritual to his disciples. In order to give full weight to this observation we must bear in mind that in the priestly writings Israel's holiness was maintained by ritual and cult as well as by ethics. Because Israel was

⁽³⁸⁾ Cf. F. HAHN, *Der urchristliche Gottesdienst* (SBS 41; Stuttgart 1970) 26, who interprets it as a critique of the representatives of the Temple cult, and ÅDNA, *Jesu Stellung zum Tempel*, 434, n. 3, who denies the phrase contained such a critical intention. That Jesus sent the 10 lepers he had healed to the Temple to show themselves to the priests (Luke 17,12-19) is not a strong argument for his recognition of the Temple, either (cf. ÅDNA, *Jesu Stellung zum Tempel*, 435). According to J. Ådna Jesus in sending them to the Temple tested whether they would address their gratitude to God to the right place.

holy, they had to keep the Sabbath, refrain from unclean food, keep the purity regulations and observe the commandments pertaining to social behaviour. Ritual purity was in no way considered inferior to ethical purity. Even the prophets, for all their concern for social justice, did not abrogate ritual and cult.

The two sayings of Jesus about tithing mint (Matt 23,23 par. Luke 11,42) and cleaning the outside of the cup (Matt 23,25-26 par. Luke 11,39-41) show, that according to him even the most accurate observance of the cultic and ritual law is useless, if a person's ethical conduct does not come up to the will of God. It is possible to fulfil minutely the ritual prescriptions of the law while at the same time neglecting "its weightier matters", namely "justice and the love of God" (as Luke 11,42, alluding to Deut 6,5, puts it). What Jesus criticizes in these instances is not the fulfilment of certain minor commandments (i.e. the purity laws), but the neglect of the most important one, the injunction to love. However, the outer purification of vessels or — this is the meaning of Luke 11,39⁽³⁹⁾ — men, plays little or no part in Jesus' view. It takes care of itself or becomes altogether redundant, when people are inwardly pure: "First clean the inside of the cup, so that the outside also may become clean" (Matt 23,26 par. Luke 11,41). In a warning to the scribes, Jesus accuses them of trying to harmonize robbery with long prayers, declaring the latter to be "for a pretence" (Mark 12,40 par. Luke 20,47; secondarily also in Matt 23,14). It follows that, according to Jesus, even prayers are useless if one transgresses God's ethical commandments. On the other hand, Jesus' reply to the Pharisees' and Herodians' question about paying taxes to Caesar confirms that even contact with a pagan occupying power does not defile the person who "renders to God the things that are God's" (i.e., unconditional devotion in obedience to his will) (Mark 12,17 par.)⁽⁴⁰⁾.

⁽³⁹⁾ Cf. I.H. MARSHALL, *The Gospel of Luke* (NIGTC; Exeter 1978) 494: "Since ... the OT law required the cleansing of the latter [i.e. the inside] (Lev 11:33; 15:12 ...), we must conclude that Jesus' words do not reflect the custom of cleansing merely the exterior of a vessel; rather he is suggesting that the Pharisaic ritual of only washing the outside of a man is as foolish as only washing the exterior of a dirty vessel". Cf., however, *mKel.* 25:6, which "contemplates liquids falling on certain parts of vessels such as the handles, in which case you wipe them and they are clean" (M. CASEY, *An Aramaic Approach to Q. Sources for the Gospels of Matthew and Luke* [Cambridge 2002] 77).

⁽⁴⁰⁾ There is a religious background to this question: For the Zealots and those taking side with them "the payment of tribute to the Romans was incompatible with Israel's theocratic ideals. This must have been because the Romans were pagans"

The parable of the Pharisee and the tax collector also illustrates that what matters before God is not ritual purity but a right heart (Luke 18,9-14). It is striking that in all these instances, even though Jesus does not speak out against the purity Torah directly, he does draw a contrast between ritual and ethical holiness. He emphasizes ethical purity, while at the same time denying ritual purity any significance of its own.

In the Sermon on the Mount Jesus blesses those who are “pure in heart”; to them he promises that “they shall see God”, i.e. the very essence of what people would have expected from the Temple cult (Matt 5,8; cf. Ps 42,3).

The one instance where Jesus does speak out against the purity Torah is his statement reported in Mark 7,15 (par. Matt 15,11), that nothing that comes from outside can defile a person or diminish a person’s holiness. What does compromise one’s purity and holiness is the evil within a person (cf. the ethical description of evil in Mark 7,21-22 par. Matt 15,19). This saying of Jesus is generally considered to be authentic⁽⁴¹⁾. A number of scholars have interpreted it to mean that Jesus only attaches different importance to the respective commandments. This would amount to a devaluation of ritual purity over against ethical purity⁽⁴²⁾. However, if it were interpreted in this

(F.F. BRUCE, “Render to Caesar”, *Jesus and the Politics of His Day* [ed. E. Bammel – C.F.D. Moule] [Cambridge 1984] 254f). Cf. M. Hengel, *Die Zeloten* (Leiden – Köln 1961) 134–136, 144: According to the radical interpretation of the first commandment by Judas Galilaeus — who had numerous supporters amongst the people — the person who paid taxes to Caesar ceased to be a true Israelite; he was to be looked upon as a Gentile and a tax collector. What is at stake, therefore, is not only Jesus’ popularity with the people, but his religious integrity in the eyes of the Zealots and their supporters. The passage shows that Jesus’ concept of holiness differed greatly from that of the Zealots. He follows the line of the prophets, who taught to interpret suppression by their enemies as a judgement of God on the sins of his people, and who therefore obliged the people to pay taxes (Ezek 21,25-32; Jer 27,4-22; cf. BRUCE, “Render to Caesar”, 255-256).

(⁴¹) Some scholars, like H. Räisänen, “Jesus and the Food Laws”, *JSNT* 16 (1982) 79-100, deny its authenticity. See, however, N.T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (London 1996) 397: “Double dissimilarity (the proposal is scandalous for Jews, the secrecy unnecessary for the early church) is balanced by double similarity (the dispute presupposes the Jewish context; the new outlook was eventually and gradually worked out in the early church, with Mark 7.19b as one important step in that process). It must be regarded as highly likely that Jesus said, cryptically, something much like this”.

(⁴²) Cf. e. g. Dunn, *Jesus and Holiness*, 188, who considers the version in Matthew 15 “closer to what Jesus actually said... If this is the case then we cannot

way, it would still have been a great challenge to all who adhered to the entire Torah⁽⁴³⁾. “Indeed, what is dismissed now as being of lesser importance is more clearly set out in the Law than what is here regarded as essential!”⁽⁴⁴⁾. Even if one follows this strand of interpretation, therefore, the saying in Mark 7,15 would have been a total novelty in contemporary Judaism. As far as Mark’s understanding is concerned, he points out clearly, that he did not understand the saying in this way (7,19c), and that in his day it was interpreted as an abrogation of the purity Torah in general⁽⁴⁵⁾.

According to S. M. Bryan Jesus’ saying initially referred to “food with second decree impurity”, i.e., food that in itself was pure but which had incurred impurity by contact with impure things, not to food that was impure in itself (like unclean animals) (i.e. to *toharot* over against *kashrut*)⁽⁴⁶⁾. Bryan holds that if one knew Jesus’ saying in Mark 7,15 as well as “the severely constricted significance of impurity in [his] message”, it was no big step to the early church’s accepting the consumption of food that was impure in itself (cf. Acts 10,14.15.28; 11,8-9; Rom 14,14)⁽⁴⁷⁾. However, if we believe that the early church was capable of taking such a step, we should at least consider whether it is not even more likely that Jesus himself took it. He taught with such authority that “the people were astonished” (Mark 1,22). It is much more difficult to imagine that the church would have taken a saying of Jesus which referred merely to human rules (namely the washing of hands) and turned it into a refutation of important commandments of the Torah. Certainly, Mark had no reason to invent a saying to this effect, since he even “has to explain the Jewish customs about

say with any confidence that Jesus called for a total disregard for the laws of clean and unclean. But he did indicate, in typically prophetic fashion, that moral impurity should be regarded as more serious than ritual impurity”.

⁽⁴³⁾ Cf. M.D. HOOKER, *The Gospel According to St Mark* (BNTC; London 1991) 179. There is, of course, a discussion on the “weightier things” in Rabbinic Judaism (cf. CASEY, *An Aramaic Approach*, 74-75). But it did not generally downgrade ritual law over against ethical law in the way Mark 7,15 does. In Jesus’s day the purity Torah was a major concern to all of the main Jewish groupings.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ HOOKER, *Mark*, 179.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ Cf. HOOKER, *Mark*, 179.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ S.M. BRYAN, *Jesus and Israel’s Traditions of Judgement and Restoration* (MSSNTS 117; Cambridge 2002) 165; cf. BOCKMUEHL, *Jewish Law*, 11.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ BRYAN, *Jesus*, 168. According to BRYAN, “such a conclusion would not have been driven by the belief that Jesus had revoked the laws against forbidden meats, but that such laws had been eschatologically obviated”.

handwashing to his readers”⁽⁴⁸⁾. That there was much uncertainty concerning the issue in the early church, does not necessarily imply that Jesus did not state his opinion on it clearly. Rom 14,14 (cf. 14,20 and Tit 1,15) is still best explained as a reference to this saying of Jesus⁽⁴⁹⁾. If he did not “fight” against the law (as Räisänen would have him do)⁽⁵⁰⁾, but declared it to be fulfilled because the *basileia* had dawned, and if he did so only in a cryptic way in public (Mark 7,15) but more clearly in private (as Mark 7,17-18 states and N. T. Wright emphasizes)⁽⁵¹⁾, it is conceivable that the church only gradually moved away from its adherence to the purity Torah⁽⁵²⁾. It would have done so to the extent that it realized that it had been called to be the “vanguard of the eschatological Israel on earth”⁽⁵³⁾. As Mark rightly saw, Jesus will have taken the issue of washing one’s hands as a starting point, but then insisted “that genuine purity is a matter of the heart, for which the normal purity laws ... are of no relevance”⁽⁵⁴⁾.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ WRIGHT, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 397.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ Counter RÄISÄNEN, “Food Laws”, 87, and in agreement with S. WESTERHOLM, *Jesus and Scribal Authority* (CB.NT 10; Lund 1978) 81f. Some scholars have pointed out that in the Galatian conflict (cf. Gal 2,11-14), Paul does not quote any such saying of Jesus (RÄISÄNEN, “Food Laws”, 142f; D. RUDOLPH, “Jesus and the Food Laws. A Reassessment of Mark 7:19”, *EQ* 74 [2002], 301). However, at a closer look it seems that Jesus’ saying as well as its confirmation reported in Acts 10 are presupposed in Gal 2. In 2,14 Paul can say that Peter lives “like a Gentile and not like a Jew”. What other warrant would there have been for Peter to “live like a Gentile”, if not the word of Jesus?

⁽⁵⁰⁾ “Food Laws”, 87.

⁽⁵¹⁾ *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 397. Ibid.: “For Mark, the abolition, or simple ignoring, of Jewish food taboos was not something that needed to be whispered behind locked doors. By his time it was well out in the open”. This “secrecy unnecessary for the early church” is a hint, that Jesus did say “cryptically, something much like this”.

⁽⁵²⁾ Cf. WRIGHT, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 397: “The new outlook was eventually and gradually worked out in the early church, with Mark 7.19b as one important step in that process”.

⁽⁵³⁾ STUHLMACHER, *Biblische Theologie*, I, 200 (translation mine). The argument sometimes adduced in this context (see e.g., KŁAWANS, *Impurity and Sin*, 145; RUDOLPH, “Jesus and the Food Laws”, 301-302), that in early church history the adherence of Gentile Christians to the purity Torah is witnessed to, needs to be interpreted the other way round: In church history we more often see a tendency to greater observance of the law than to greater freedom. It is much more likely that Jesus declared the food laws to be obsolete and that the church giving in to pressure from Jewish Christians reintroduced them than the opposite. We see this very movement towards stricter observance of the law as early as Gal 2,1-14.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ WRIGHT, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 396.

The same indifference towards the purity Torah underlies Jesus' summons to his disciples to eat and drink what is provided (Luke 10,7-8). Again, we will not have to assume that the disciples, wandering through Jewish territory, have ever been offered unclean animals as a meal. Here, too, we have to think primarily of food with second decree impurity. But it is striking that Jesus does not limit his statement to this effect, so that in principle it could be taken to include even unclean animals. In the same way Jesus' words in Mark 7,15 imply that all foods are clean, thus rendering obsolete the Pentateuchal distinction, crucial to Israel's holiness, between clean and unclean animals (cf. Lev 11,44-45; 20,25-26). We cannot overestimate the consequences of such a statement. Not only did it run counter to all strands of contemporary Judaism; its full implication declared permissible that which (for all we know) would have led to expulsion from Judaism⁽⁵⁵⁾. In abrogating the purity Torah, Jesus declared obsolete the division of the world into priests, Israel and the (unclean) nations, a division symbolized by those purity commands. The abolition of the latter, which had hitherto singled Israel out from the nations, effectively attributes to the Gentiles a share in Israel's holiness⁽⁵⁶⁾. That Mark was aware of this implication is shown by the fact that immediately after this dispute he relates Jesus' encounter with two Gentiles in Syrophenicia and the Decapolis.

c) Sabbath

In looking at the stories about Jesus and the Sabbath, we need to keep in mind that the Sabbath command was the primary mark of Israel's holiness, especially according to Ezekiel, Third Isaiah, and Jubilees. To treat it lightly would have meant to violate that holiness. Yet, Jesus heals a man's hand on a Sabbath (Mark 3,1-6 parr.). For him, the restoration of a crippled woman and a man who had dropsy justifies the transgression of the Sabbath command (Luke 13,10-17; 14,1-6). As the ruler of the synagogue rightly states (13,14), there was

⁽⁵⁵⁾ Cf. BRYAN, *Jesus*, 166: "For eating unclean prohibited food the consequence, though not specified in the priestly code, was presumably the same as for apostasy, namely, *kārēt* (see e.g. *Ant.* 11.346-7)". The verses preceding the commandments to abstain from unclean animals in the context of Israel's sanctification (Lev 20,25-26), namely Lev 20,22-23, also seem to suggest this. The fact that the consumption of unclean animals was such an abominable thing in contemporary Judaism, explains why in spite of Jesus' statement the early Christians found it so hard to follow it (cf. Acts 10,14).

⁽⁵⁶⁾ Cf. WENHAM, "Christ's Healing Ministry", 119-122.

no need for Jesus to heal that woman on the Sabbath. There is no danger to life — the only case in which most groups in contemporary Judaism would have allowed for immediate action⁽⁵⁷⁾. Calling the woman “a daughter of Abraham” and his healing act “a deliverance from the bondage to Satan”, Jesus clarifies that in restoring her he fulfils his ministry of restoring Israel. “The claim was that the sabbath day was the most appropriate day, because that day celebrated release from captivity” and from “bondage”⁽⁵⁸⁾. To discuss Jesus’ attitude towards the sabbath within the framework of the legal disputes of early Judaism, as E. P. Sanders does, therefore seems to miss the point. It makes it impossible to account for the Pharisees’ and the Herodians’ decision to kill Jesus, which Mark reports to have been a reaction to the Sabbath controver-sies⁽⁵⁹⁾. Jesus’ attitude towards the Sabbath differed fundamentally from that of the Pharisees in that “his opposition never took expression in specific regulations proposed as alternatives to Pharisaic ones”⁽⁶⁰⁾. “When opposed he does not reply by arguing that, counter to his opponents’ claims, work has not been done nor the command transgressed”⁽⁶¹⁾. Even where he does take up the rabbinic discussion about what is permissible on a Sabbath (Mark 3,4; Luke 13,15-16; 14,5), “the dispute” is not “about the fine-tuned interpretation of Torah, such as might have taken place at any time”⁽⁶²⁾. He constantly argues from a perspective of love as the centre of the Sabbath commandment, rather than addressing its boundaries in a rabbinic manner⁽⁶³⁾.

Jesus, as the messianic Son of God, claims to be Lord of the Sabbath (Mark 2,23-28 parr.). The story about the disciples plucking heads of

⁽⁵⁷⁾ For the Jewish debate on the legitimacy of life saving actions on the Sabbath cf. BOCKMUEHL, *Jewish Law*, 7.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ WRIGHT, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 394f.

⁽⁵⁹⁾ E.P. SANDERS, *Jesus and Judaism* (London – Philadelphia 1985) 264-267 and *The Historical Figure of Jesus* (London 1993) 212-218, as well as several exegetes following him have cast doubt on the authenticity of the stories in the synoptic gospels where the sabbath is the major issue. He claims that what Jesus did on the Sabbath did not transcend the range of current disputes and that as far as sabbath-observance is concerned, “there is no actual transgression of the law on the part of Jesus” (*Jesus and Judaism* 265). For a reply to Sanders cf. WRIGHT, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 390-396.

⁽⁶⁰⁾ WESTERHOLM, *Jesus and Scribal Authority*, 102.

⁽⁶¹⁾ S. WESTERHOLM, “Sabbath”, *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, 719.

⁽⁶²⁾ WRIGHT, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 393.

⁽⁶³⁾ Cf. U. LUZ, *Matthew 8-20. A Commentary* (A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible; Minneapolis 2001) 188.

grain on a Sabbath, too, is more than a demonstration that Jesus considers human need more important than cultic law. In this dispute Jesus refers to David, who like him was the designated king and high priest of Israel and therefore had the right to make use of the "bread of the presence". According to Matthew, he also reminds his opponents that the Sabbath law does not apply in the temple. Just as there can be no scruples about the Sabbath in the temple, because the very holiness of God dwells there, so also the Son of Man conveys God's holiness in such a way that the distinction between holy and unholy times no longer applies to those around him. In him, "something greater than the temple is here", as Matt 12,6 comments. In him, the very holiness of God is present. Because the original intention of the Sabbath command is fulfilled, its literal fulfilment is no longer an issue⁽⁶⁴⁾. What we have here is a "clash of agendas", not a legal controversy⁽⁶⁵⁾.

By way of summary we can say that according to the unanimous presentation of all the gospels, Jesus, like the prophets, gives preeminence to the ethical sanctification of Israel over against the ritual⁽⁶⁶⁾. If need be he subordinates ritual obligations to the ethical core of the will of God. But not only that. In light of the dawning kingdom, ritual law loses its relevance for the sanctification of Israel. The reality to which it points has come. Its literal fulfilment, therefore, has lost its significance.

6. *Jesus' Attitude Towards the Temple Cult*

In the Old Testament, the cult is the primary means of maintaining Israel's holiness. It is at the very centre of Ezekiel's concept of a

⁽⁶⁴⁾ The claim that Jesus "affirmed the sanctity of the Sabbath" (cf. BOCKMUEHL, *Jewish Law*, 8), does not seem to be fully warranted in the light of Mark 2,28. Counter to Bockmuehl (ibid. 13) the christological interpretation of this passage is preferable, since "Son of Man" must be interpreted christologically in 2,10 and cannot be taken "as a reference to humankind in general" by any means: cf. O. BETZ, *Jesus. Der Messias Israels*. Aufsätze zur biblischen Theologie (WUNT 42; Tübingen 1987) 198f and ID., *Jesus. Herr der Kirche*. Aufsätze zur biblischen Theologie II (WUNT 52; Tübingen 1990) 412-413. To those around him Jesus was conspicuous for his transgressions of the Sabbath.

⁽⁶⁵⁾ WRIGHT, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 395.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ Cf. WESTERHOLM, "Clean and Unclean", 131: "While the words at times suggest that the cultic and ritual aspects of religion have no place whatever in a world of ideal piety, the point is rather the condemnation of wrongs than the advocacy of a religion without cult (cf. Amos 5,21-26; Isa 1,10-17; Jer 7,21-24; etc.)."

renewed Israel. We therefore need to consider what importance Jesus assigned to it.

There are several hints in the synoptics that Jesus did not attack the Temple cult from the outset: Jesus often taught in the Temple (Mark 14,49 par.; cf. Luke 19,47; 21,37). According to Matthew, Jesus, like his Jewish contemporaries, regards the Temple as God's dwelling place (Matt 23,21) and as "the holy place" (24,15). Matthew reports Jesus' saying about bringing one's *dōron* (in the LXX mostly for *qorban* or *mincha*) to the Temple (Matt 5,23). This presupposes that the followers of Jesus still offer certain sacrifices in the Temple. According to Luke, Jesus, when he is 12 years old, declares the Temple to be his "Father's house", where he is to be (2,49).

On the other hand, Jesus holds the Temple tax to be dispensable (unlike the Pharisees who were strongly in favour of it)⁽⁶⁷⁾. He asks Peter all the same to pay it for the two of them, in order "not to give offence to them" (Matt 17,27). Here, as in Matt 8,4, Jesus is depicted as fulfilling cultic obligations for the sake of the Temple priests, even though he considers them to be obsolete or (in the case of the Temple tax) even criticizes them.

Only towards the end of his time on earth, when the conflict with his opponents came to a point, did Jesus question the sacrificial cult in principle. As J. Ådna puts it:

In the presence of God's eschatological action in and through his Son and representative, Jesus, the religious leaders, and with them the whole nation, are called to disengage from the old cultic order and to open up to the imminent kingdom of God. The Temple action symbolically puts an end to the sacrificial cult and points to the new 'house of prayer', which due to the perfect salvation that the *basileia* entails no longer serves for making atonement⁽⁶⁸⁾.

Jesus' Temple logion (Mark 14,58), which he may have uttered during the cleansing of the Temple⁽⁶⁹⁾, expresses his claim to be "the messianic builder of the eschatological Temple on Zion, which is part

⁽⁶⁷⁾ According to W. HORBURY, "The Temple Tax", *Jesus and the Politics of His Day* (ed. E. BAMMEL – C.F.D. MOULE) (Cambridge 1984) 282-283, "it is best to take the 'sons' as Israel in general, rather than Jesus and his followers in particular, since the unadorned description of other Jews as foreigners which the latter would imply does not occur elsewhere in Jesus' teaching". This would imply that Jesus was generally critical of the Temple tax, and did not just deny the necessity to pay it for himself, the Son of God.

⁽⁶⁸⁾ ÅDNA, *Jesu Stellung zum Tempel*, 433 (translation mine).

⁽⁶⁹⁾ Cf. ÅDNA, *Jesu Stellung zum Tempel*, 151-152 (translation mine).

of the final realization of the eschatological kingdom on Zion" ⁽⁷⁰⁾. Here once again the root of Jesus' understanding of holiness, which at the same time is the root of his conflict with the Pharisees, comes to light: It is the dawning of the *basileia* in his own life and work.

Besides the cleansing of the Temple, Matthew and Luke report Jesus' lament over Jerusalem and the Temple (Luke 13,34-35 par. Matt 23,37-39; cf. Luke 19,41-44). In this lament Jesus speaks as the personification of God's *shekinah*. Like the prophets (Mic 3,11-12; Jer 7; Ezek 10,18-22; 11,22-23), he announces the end of the Temple, where the *shekinah* has hitherto dwelt, as judgement for the disobedience of the inhabitants of Jerusalem ⁽⁷¹⁾. The passage closes with an outlook on his welcome in Jerusalem as messianic king after that judgement.

When the religious leaders finally reject Jesus' call to repentance and decide to kill him, he is willing to die for their salvation and for the salvation of the world ⁽⁷²⁾. Jesus' last Passover marks the point of transition to this new situation: Again, it is true that Jesus keeps the Passover regulations, for he duly celebrates it in Jerusalem (Mark 14,13 parr.) and spends the night within the territory of the city (cf. Deut 16,6-7 to Mark 14,26 parr.). It is not, however, an ordinary Passover that he celebrates, but the proleptic celebration of the new covenant (cf. Mark 14,24 parr. to Ezek 45,21-22), which he is about to inaugurate through his death, in view of the coming *basileia* (Mark 14,25 par. Matt 26,29; cf. Luke 22,16) ⁽⁷³⁾. This is in harmony with Ezek 45,21-22, where a new Passover, which "has inaugural significance" for the new covenant, is celebrated ⁽⁷⁴⁾.

Finally the curtain shielding the Most Holy Place as the place of God's presence, where the high priest on Yom Kippur made atonement,

⁽⁷⁰⁾ ÅDNA, *Jesu Stellung zum Tempel*, 143, 146 (translation mine). Cf. *ibid.*, 50-89 for the expectation that the *Messiah* will build the eschatological Temple.

⁽⁷¹⁾ Cf. GESE, *Alttestamentliche Studien*, 237-238: "When the *shekinah* leaves the second Temple, the latter is destroyed like the first Temple according to Ezek 10 ... The fact that in the lament over Jerusalem Jesus appears as the *shekinah*, helps us understand the comparison of his death and resurrection to the destruction and reconstruction of the Temple in Mark 14,58; 15,29 par". (translation mine).

⁽⁷²⁾ ÅDNA, *Jesu Stellung zum Tempel*, 440.

⁽⁷³⁾ Cf. P. STUHLMACHER, *Jesus von Nazareth – Christus des Glaubens* (Stuttgart 1988) 76-77. Of the Gospels, only Luke (cf. 1 Cor 11,25) explicitly speaks of the *new* covenant; but it is also implied in Mark and Matthew.

⁽⁷⁴⁾ Cf. D.I. BLOCK, *The Book of Ezekiel*. Chapters 25-48 (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI 1997) II, 667.

was torn in two at Jesus' death (Mark 15,38 par. Matt 27,51; cf. Luke 23,45). The significance of this event is that Jesus takes the place of the sacrificial cult and that from now on he is the one who sanctifies the people for God⁽⁷⁵⁾. "Jesus' atoning death ... opens up the *prosagōgē eis ton theon* (cf. Rom 5,2) without further priestly-cultic mediation"⁽⁷⁶⁾. Viewed from the end of the synoptic gospels, the cultic legislation comes to its end, even though the authors (giving a historically accurate account) initially portray Jesus as being faithful to it.

*
* *

By way of summary we can say that the synoptic gospels portray Jesus as the one, who brings about the reality to which the petition for the sanctification of the name of God refers by his messianic-prophetic life as well as by his death.

He appeared as "the Holy One of God" (Mark 1,24; cf. Luke 1,35; Matt 1,23), with whom the time of the outpouring of the Spirit and the messianic fulfilment of the prophetic notion of holiness was to break in. As the Holy One of God, he was to gather the people of God. To start with, it was within Israel that he called people to follow him. He cleansed and restored people who had become disqualified for the kingdom of God through sin or impurity, forgiving their sins, driving out demons, purifying people from their impurities. He made it clear that he had come to fulfil the promises concerning the eschatological sanctification of Israel. But in harmony with those promises he already began to open the people of God for the Gentiles. In this, he clearly followed the eschatological prophets, who had announced that the Gentiles would have a share in the people of God.

Only if one takes into account that with Jesus the *basileia* is

⁽⁷⁵⁾ Cf. M. HENGEL, *The Atonement. The Origins of the Doctrine in the New Testament* (Philadelphia 1981) 42 and YATES, *The Spirit*, 236. According to an alternative interpretation, it was the outer veil which was rent, this being a portent of the impending destruction of the Temple. Such portents are reported in Jos., *Bell* vi,5a; Tacitus, *Hist.* v,13; Ps.Clem., *Recogn.* 1,41; Hier., *Ep.* 120,8,2 and *Comm. in Matt.* c.27,51. Cf. the presentation of this view by R. BROWN, *The Death of the Messiah. From Gethsemane to the Grave. A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels* (London 1994) II, 1098-1120. Both interpretations imply the symbolic termination of the Temple cult and are congruent with the atoning significance Mark (following Jesus) attributes to Jesus' death (cf. Mark 10,45; 14,24).

⁽⁷⁶⁾ STUHLMACHER, *Biblische Theologie*, I, 148 (translation mine).

already breaking in, can one fully appreciate the vehemence of the dispute about purity and cult between Jesus and the Pharisees and priests respectively. Jesus does not only point out a principle that has always been given, and which is merely not recognized by his opponents. Rather, he proclaims and brings about a new reality, the beginning of the universal sanctification promised in Ezekiel 36 and Zech 14,20-21. It is from there that we have to understand his conception of holiness as well as his rejection of the pharisaic concept of holiness, which in itself was a striving after this universal holiness.

The Torah of Jesus is more than a simple and questionable freedom from Torah, it is the foundation of complete and perfect *shalom*, in which God's holiness penetrates the furthest depths of the world⁽⁷⁷⁾.

On the one hand Jesus seems to transgress the Torah by breaking the Sabbath, declaring the food laws to be obsolete, and by associating with impure people and sinners. At the same time he affirms the ongoing validity of the Torah (Matt 5,18 par. Luke 16,17)⁽⁷⁸⁾ and sometimes even renders it more stringent by his interpretation (Matt 5,32 and 19,9 parr.). We cannot but distinguish between Jesus' attitudes towards the ethical and towards the cultic Torah. However, such a distinction is not to be carried out in the classical sense of Reformed theology, according to which Jesus disposed of the cultic (as well as the civil) Torah, while affirming the validity of the moral Torah. After all, the Sabbath laws, the laws concerning pure and impure animals (Lev 11) and the laws concerning the exclusion of impure people from the cult (Lev 7,19-21) or, in severe cases, from the people (Lev 13,46; Num 5,2-4), are just as much a part of the requirements ensuring Israel's holiness, by which it was to stand out from among the nations and their practices (Lev 20,22-27), as was the commandment of love (Lev 19,18). To abolish these commandments would have been to jeopardize Israel's holiness.

We need to understand that Jesus, as the Holy One of God, fulfils the Torah in its deepest sense. His coming, his actions and his death ultimately sanctify his people. Therefore, there is no longer any need for the literal keeping of the purity Torah.

⁽⁷⁷⁾ GESE, *Essays on Biblical Theology*, 88.

⁽⁷⁸⁾ The fact that this logion is handed down by Matthew and Luke, but in totally different contexts, makes it rather unlikely that it is a mere reflection of their own theology. It seems to be part of ancient traditions.

Jesus was not lightly setting Torah aside, as a false prophet urging people to abandon their ancient loyalties... He was claiming ... to be inaugurating the new age in Israel's history, to which the Mosaic law pointed but for which it was [no longer] adequate⁽⁷⁹⁾.

Jesus' attitude towards the ethical Torah is equally rooted in the new reality he brought about: He interprets the Torah in God's authority, in order to teach the newly gathered people of God, how to live a holy life. He emphasizes love and mercy as the essence of holiness. Taking the double commandment of love as his starting point, Jesus newly interprets the Torah and attributes different weight to each of its individual commandments. He does so in his authority as the "beloved Son", to whom one has "to listen" (Mark 9,7). Jesus not only taught the Torah in messianic authority, but he also enabled his disciples to fulfil it by calling them to follow him, thus granting them communion with God.

When the majority of Israel rejected Jesus' messianic call to repentance, he completed his messianic role by taking upon himself death upon a cross as atonement for Israel and — beyond that — for the whole of humankind. In him, God "commits himself to the world by drawing all that is secular into the holy", thus "taking total possession of the world in a final revelation and penetration"⁽⁸⁰⁾.

21 Chaucer Road
Cambridge CB2 2EB (UK)

Hanna STETTLER

SUMMARY

According to the Synoptic Jesus tradition, Jesus brings about the eschatological sanctification of Israel promised in Ez 36,22-32 and 37,28. He ushers in the time of the Holy Spirit, and gathers God's eschatological people, which includes sinners as well as Gentiles. Moreover, he sanctifies people by healing and cleansing them, and teaches them to live a holy life. According to Jesus, the holiness of God's holy people is no longer jeopardized by ritual impurity. This is not because ritual purity is irrelevant per se, but because in Jesus, the "Holy One of God", God's holiness has come into the world. Jesus sanctifies people and time so completely that the intention of the ritual Torah is fulfilled. Holiness is now to be lived out through mercy and love, even for one's enemy.

⁽⁷⁹⁾ WRIGHT, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 646.

⁽⁸⁰⁾ GESE, *Essays on Biblical Theology*, 86.

Jesus gegen Dionysos? Ein Beitrag zur Kontextualisierung des Johannesevangeliums

Diese Untersuchung will eine hintergründige Argumentationsebene des Johannesevangeliums (wieder) "ins Spiel" der wissenschaftlichen Forschung bringen. Unter vielen anderen Argumentationssträngen läßt sich einer in diesem Evangelium herauskristallisieren, der sich als jüdisch-christliche Auseinandersetzung mit dem Dionysoskult fassen läßt. Allerdings wird hier nicht mit einem Frontalangriff gegen alles Dionysische polemisiert, sondern vielmehr durch eine überbietende Rezeption dionysischer Elemente für den Christus als den einzigen Sohn des einzigen Gottes gestritten. Es wird zu zeigen sein, daß eine johanneische Auseinandersetzung mit solchen paganen Elementen gerade keinen Widerspruch zur Annahme bildet, das Johannesevangelium sei in einer jüdisch-christlichen Kontroverse im Raum Palästina und Syrien im ersten Jahrhundert n. Chr. entstanden⁽¹⁾. Es gab damals dort schon alte Traditionen der "Dionysierung" des israelitischen Gottesbildes. Vieles spricht dafür, daß der Evangelist im Rahmen einer solchen kulturellen Kontextualisierung denkt und zugleich geprägt ist von "alten" jüdischen Strategien des Umgangs mit dem immer wieder bedrängenden und attraktiven Dionysoskult. Diese Strategien zeichnen sich grundsätzlich nicht nur durch Abwehr-, sondern auch durch Integrationstendenzen aus. Methodisch wird die Grundlage der neueren kulturwissenschaftlichen Debatte vorausgesetzt, nämlich daß eine Kultur nie eine in sich abgeschlossene Größe ist, sondern immer auch durch Hybridisierungen mit anderen Kulturen entstanden ist.

1. Forschungsgeschichte

Die Geschichte vom Weinwunder auf der Hochzeit zu Kana in Joh 2,1-11 gab im letzten Jahrhundert immer wieder Anlaß, nach dionysischen Einflüssen zu fragen. Bultmann war nicht der erste, der die Hypothese vertrat, daß es sich dabei um die Übertragung des

⁽¹⁾ K. WENGST, *Das Johannesevangelium* (Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament; Stuttgart 2000) I, 21-26.

Wunders der Epiphanie des Dionysos auf Jesus handle⁽²⁾. Mit einer kleinen, aber wirkungsvollen Monographie "Christus und Dionysos" widerspricht Heinz Noetzel 1960 Bultmann. Er sprach der Perikope von der Hochzeit zu Kana jeglichen dionysischen Einfluß ab⁽³⁾. Eines seiner wichtigsten Argumente war, daß die Dionysos zugeschriebenen Flüssigkeitswunder nie von einer eigentlichen Wandlung von Wasser zu Wein berichten⁽⁴⁾.

Seither wurde Noetzel aber in Aufsätzen und Monographien zu Joh 2,1-11 mehrfach widerlegt. Eta Linnemann vertrat die These, daß mit Joh 2,1-11 ein "bewußter Gegenentwurf" gegen den Dionysoskult greifbar werde, der "integrierender Bestandteil des Dialogs zwischen Christengemeinde und Dionysosmysten und allein als solcher voll verständlich" sei⁽⁵⁾. In einem grundlegenden Aufsatz zeigte Morton Smith mit vielen Quellen, wie stark nicht nur Joh 2, sondern auch das Alte Testament, Palästina und das Judentum von dionysischen Motiven beeinflusst waren⁽⁶⁾. Daran anknüpfend zeigte Martin Hengel, wie diese auch Eingang in die Haggada gefunden haben, welche dadurch in den Wettbewerb mit dem griechischen Weingott treten konnte. Seine Schlußfolgerung lautet: Der Gegensatz hier Dionysos, dort Altes Testament und Judentum, sei — gerade in Bezug auf die

⁽²⁾ R. BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (KEK 2; Göttingen 21986) 83 und Anm. 3.

⁽³⁾ H. NOETZEL, *Christus und Dionysos*. Bemerkungen zum religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund von Johannes 2,1-11 (AVTRW 11; Berlin 1960). Zur Wirkung Noetzels s. z. B. A. SMITMANS, *Das Weinwunder von Kana*. Die Auslegung von Joh 2,1-11 bei den Vätern und heute (BGBE 6; Tübingen 1966) 33-34, der in dieser Frage ganz unter dem Einfluß von Noetzel steht, und J. BREUSS, *Das Kanawunder*. Hermeneutische und pastorale Überlegungen aufgrund einer phänomenologischen Analyse von Joh 2,1-12 (Freiburg 1976) 45.

⁽⁴⁾ NOETZEL, *Christus und Dionysos*, 27; dieses Argument wurde zuletzt ausführlich widerlegt von I. BROER, "Das Weinwunder zu Kana (Joh 2,1-11) und die Weinwunder der Antike", *Das Urchristentum in seiner literarischen Geschichte* (FS J. Becker) (Hrsg. U. MELL – U.B. MÜLLER) (Berlin – New York 1999) 308; vgl. auch *Neuer Wettstein*. Texte zum Neuen Testament aus Griechentum und Hellenismus (Hrsg. U. SCHNELLE) (Berlin – New York 2001) I/2, 111-112 mit bemerkenswert vielen Parallelstellen zur Wandlung von Wasser zu Wein in Joh 2,8.

⁽⁵⁾ E. LINNEMANN, "Die Hochzeit zu Kana und Dionysos [Joh 2:1-11]", *NTS* 20 (1974) 417-418.

⁽⁶⁾ M. SMITH, "On the Wine God in Palestine", *Studies in the Cult of Yahweh* (Hrsg. S.J.D. COHEN) (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 130; Leiden 1996) I, 227-237 (zuerst in: *Salo W. Baron Jubilee Volume* [Hrsg. S. LIEBERMAN] [Jerusalem 1975] 815-829).

Weintradition — veraltet. "Dionysus had been at home in Palestine for a long time". Gerade deshalb müsse man bei unserem Weinwunder nicht von einem direkten oder bewußt übernommenen paganen Einfluß sprechen. Aufgrund der Vermehrungs- und Wandlungswunder und der verbreiteten Weinsymbolik im Alten Testament sei ein solches Wunder sowohl für den Messias Israels als auch für eine heidnische Gottheit passend gewesen⁽⁷⁾. Edmund Little zeigt, wie tief die Kanageschichte im Alten Testament verwurzelt ist. Er weist überzeugend nach, wie das ganze Bedeutungsspektrum von Wein im Alten Testament vom Wein als Zeichen des Segens bis hin zur Gerichtssymbolik des Weins in der Geschichte des Weinwunders zu Kana anklingt und für die Interpretation dieser Perikope fruchtbar gemacht werden kann⁽⁸⁾. Wie Hengel ist er überzeugt, daß im Palästina der Zeitenwende diese alttestamentliche Verwurzelung einen Dionysos-Bezug gerade nicht ausschließt⁽⁹⁾. Walter Lütgehetmann bestreitet in seiner großen Monographie zum Weinwunder jegliche Ableitung dieser Geschichte aus dem Alten Testament und dem Judentum⁽¹⁰⁾. Die Eigenart der Kana-Perikope sei v. a. in ihrer Entstehungsgeschichte begründet, "d. h. in der Verchristlichung hellenistischer Dionysos-Motive zum Zwecke der Mission"⁽¹¹⁾. Diese Missionserzählung habe dem Evangelisten bereits vorgelegen⁽¹²⁾. Die christliche Auseinandersetzung mit Dionysos ist für ihn also deutlich

⁽⁷⁾ M. HENGEL, "The Interpretation of the Wine Miracle at Cana. John 2:1-11", *Glory of Christ in the New Testament* (Hrsg. L.D. HURST – N.T. WRIGHT) (Oxford 1987) 112.

⁽⁸⁾ E. LITTLE, *Echoes of the Old Testament in the Wine of Cana in Galilee (John 2:1-11) and the Multiplication of the Loaves and Fish (John 6,1-15)* (Paris 1998) 19-53, 61-69.

⁽⁹⁾ LITTLE, *Wine of Cana*, 54-59.

⁽¹⁰⁾ W. LÜTGEHETMANN, *Die Hochzeit von Kana (Joh 2,1-11)*. Zu Ursprung und Deutung einer Wundererzählung im Rahmen johanneischer Redaktionsgeschichte (Regensburg 1990) 261-277.

⁽¹¹⁾ LÜTGEHETMANN, *Hochzeit von Kana*, 277-282. So ist es also doch keine Übertragung einer alten, sondern eine neue Geschichte. Der Architriflinos in Joh 2,8-9 ist für ihn das wichtigste Argument, daß diese Geschichte ursprünglich nicht von einer Hochzeit in Galiläa, sondern aus dem Dionysoskult stamme, obwohl er diese Bezeichnung für den Dionysoskult nicht belegen kann (278-280). Offensichtlich beachtet Lütgehetmann den hohen Hellenisierungsgrad der Tischsitten unter den Juden Palästinas zu wenig (vgl. M. KLINGHARDT, *Gemeinschaftsmahl und Mahlgemeinschaft*. Soziologie und Liturgie frühchristlicher Mahlfeiern [Tübingen – Basel 1996]).

⁽¹²⁾ LÜTGEHETMANN, *Hochzeit von Kana*, 346.

älter als das Evangelium. Michael Labahn stellt in seiner traditions-geschichtlichen Untersuchung zu den Wundern bei Johannes hinsichtlich der Kana-Perikope fest: "Religionsgeschichtlich ist die Relation zu den dionysischen Mysterien zu beachten. ... Die übernatürliche, wunderhafte Wandlung steht für die Epiphanie Jesu nach dem Muster des Dionysos". "Die Gegenüberstellung von Jesus zu Dionysos läßt Jesus als Gott erscheinen"⁽¹³⁾. Sie entspricht einem missionarischen Interesse. Der Evangelist übernimmt diese Geschichte und fügt sie in eine auf die johanneische Gemeinde ausgerichtete Erbauungsgeschichte ein⁽¹⁴⁾. Die Verwendung von Dionysos als "Sprach- oder Bildmodell"⁽¹⁵⁾ in Joh 2,1-11 ist also für ihn wie für Lütgehetmann eindeutig älter als das Evangelium.

Zusammenfassend kann festgehalten werden, daß heute in Einzeluntersuchungen zum Weinwunder in der Regel mit einem dionysischen Hintergrund gerechnet wird und allein das Ausmaß des alttestamentlich-jüdischen Einflusses umstritten bleibt. Little hat aber gezeigt, daß die Hochzeit zu Kana weder eine exakte Kopie einer alttestamentlichen Geschichte noch eines einzigen Dionysosmythos ist. Deshalb muß schon aus methodischen Gründen mit bewußten Anspielungen auf diese beiden Bereiche gerechnet werden, wenn nicht jeglicher Rückgriff auf Traditionen bestritten werden soll⁽¹⁶⁾.

Bei neueren Arbeiten zum ganzen Evangelium zeigt sich hingegen ein anderes Bild. Bei der Behandlung der Kana-Perikope wird der dionysische Hintergrund nicht immer thematisiert und manchmal sogar bestritten⁽¹⁷⁾. Ich meine, daß es dafür sachliche Gründe gibt. Erstens: Hinter Noetzel konnte nicht mehr zurückgekehrt werden. Joh 2,1-11 ist auch in seiner Grundsubstanz keine Übertragung eines einzigen Dionysosmythos. Zweitens: Sowohl Lütgehetmann als auch Labahn kommen in ihren diachronen Analysen zu dem Schluß, daß die Auseinandersetzung mit Dionysos auf der Ebene des Evangelisten keine Rolle mehr spielt, sondern deutlich älter ist. Auch nach Hengel muß das dionysische Kolorit für die Intention des Verfassers keine

⁽¹³⁾ M. LABAHN, *Jesus als Lebensspender*. Untersuchungen zu einer Geschichte der johanneischen Tradition anhand ihrer Wundergeschichten (BZNW 98; Berlin – New York 1999) 159.

⁽¹⁴⁾ LABAHN, *Jesus als Lebensspender*, 166-167.

⁽¹⁵⁾ LABAHN, *Jesus als Lebensspender*, 158.

⁽¹⁶⁾ LITTLE, *Wine of Cana*, 49-53.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Zur Literatur, die mit einem dionysischen Einfluß rechnet s. LABAHN, *Jesus als Lebensspender*, 149 Anm. 155.

Rolle spielen. Wer also vor allem die Aussageabsicht des Evangelisten herausarbeiten will, muß auf diese Forschungsergebnisse nicht zurückgreifen. Drittens: Obwohl es unbestritten ist, daß das Wunder von Kana ein integraler Bestandteil des Evangeliums ist⁽¹⁸⁾ und daß es durch vielfältige Bezüge wie z. B. die Wasser- und Weinmetaphorik, die Bedeutungsüberlagerung von Wein und Blut und die Rede von der "gekommenen Stunde" und der "Doxa" unauflöslich mit diesem als Ganzem verwoben ist, wurde nie der Nachweis erbracht, daß das ganze Evangelium sich implizit oder explizit mit dem Dionysoskult auseinandersetzt. Wenn nur in einer Perikope solche Motive gefunden werden, ist es tatsächlich nicht ohne weiteres plausibel zu machen, weshalb diese für den Autor des Evangeliums von größerer Bedeutung gewesen sein sollten.

2. Dionysos in Palästina und im syrischen Raum

Die Bedeutung des Gottes Dionysos kann für den hellenistischen und römischen Vorderen Orient kaum hoch genug veranschlagt werden. Dieser Gott ist nicht nur besonders alt, sondern zugleich der untypischste aller wichtigen Götter. Seine Verehrung hat sich — seit dem sechsten und fünften Jh. v. Chr. gefördert durch die interpretatio graeca einheimischer Weingottheiten, wie z. B. des italischen Pater Liber/Bacchus und des etruskischen Fufluns⁽¹⁹⁾ mit ihm — im ganzen griechisch beeinflussten Kulturraum durchgesetzt und auch später in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit in der neuen Form von Mysterien ausgebreitet. Sein Kult wurde im Mythos nicht als althergebrachte, mit bestimmten Orten verbundene Sitte, sondern als eigentlicher Siegeszug dieses lokal nicht gebundenen Gottes durch die ganze Welt bis hin nach Indien gefeiert⁽²⁰⁾. Sowohl die Ptolemäer⁽²¹⁾ als auch die Seleukiden, die den Herrscherkult massiv förderten, identifizierten sich gerne mit diesem Gott. Stellvertretend für andere seien

⁽¹⁸⁾ WENGST, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 98. Der Evangelist verantwortet den vorliegenden Text als ganzen.

⁽¹⁹⁾ C. GASPARRI, "Dionysos/Bacchus", *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* (Hrsg. H.Ch. ACKERMANN u.a.) (Zürich – München 1986) III, 540-566; M. CRISTOFANI, "Dionysos/Fufluns", *Lexicon Iconographicum*, III, 531-540.

⁽²⁰⁾ Tacitus (*Hist.* 5,5,5) spricht von Vater Liber, dem Bezwinger des Orients.

⁽²¹⁾ W. BURKERT, "Bacchic Teletai in the Hellenistic Age", *Masks of Dionysus* (Hrsg. Th.H. CARPENTER – Ch.A. FARAONE) (Ithaca, NY 1993) 259-275, 262: Der Anfang wird mit der großen Prozession des Ptolemaios II um 280/275 v. Chr. historisch faßbar (Athenaeus 5,198e).

Ptolemaios IV Neos Dionysos⁽²²⁾ und Antiochus VI Epiphanes Dionysos genannt. Sie bevorzugten Dionysos nicht nur aufgrund der Vitalität, Festlichkeit und der Prachtentfaltung, die mit diesem Gott verbunden waren, sondern auch wegen der Annäherung der Alexandervita und dessen Triumphzug nach Indien mit dem Dionysosmythos. Noch Antonius und Cleopatra stilisierten sich zu Dionysos-Osiris und Aphrodite-Isis hoch und veranstalteten "ausgerechnet" in Ephesus einen großen dionysischen Triumphzug⁽²³⁾.

Der Dionysoskult der Ptolemäer und der Seleukiden hat deutliche Spuren im zweiten und dritten Buch der Makkabäer hinterlassen. Nach 2 Makk 6,7 wurden die Juden Jerusalems unter Antiochus IV Epiphanes⁽²⁴⁾ gezwungen, am Fest der Dionysien zu Ehren des Dionysos mit Efeu bekränzt in der Prozession mitzugehen⁽²⁵⁾. Nach 2 Makk 14,33 drohte Nikanor, ein Gesandter des Antiochus Eupator, als Strafaktion den Jerusalemer Tempel zu zerstören und an seiner Stelle dem Dionysos einen herrlichen Tempel zu errichten. Doch offensichtlich mußten die Juden nicht nur den Kult des Dionysos abwehren, sondern dieser hatte zugleich schon jüdische Festsitten beeinflußt. Nach 2 Makk 10,7 feierte die jüdische Bevölkerung die Reinigung des entweihten Tempels durch das Tragen von Thyrsosstäben, die eines der Hauptattribute des Dionysos und seiner Anhänger waren. Auch im um 100 v. Chr. entstandenen Judithbuch nimmt in Jdt 15,12-13 die siegreiche Judith solche Thyrsos in die Hände und gibt sie an andere Frauen weiter. Ihr Triumph wird durch einen Festzug gefeiert, der von bekränzten, tanzenden Frauen angeführt wird. Die bekränzten, Thyrsen tragenden Frauen, die seit langem neben den Satyrn zur wichtigsten Begleitung des Dionysos

⁽²²⁾ BURKERT, "Bacchic Teletai", 263; zum dionysischen Charakter des Herrscherkults der Ptolemäer bes. 268-270. H.S. VERSNEL, *Ter Unus*. Isis, Dionysos, Hermes. Three Studies in Henotheism (Leiden 1990) 204-205.

⁽²³⁾ BURKERT, "Bacchic Teletai", 264 (Plutarch, *Antonius* 24.75). Zu Pergamon als Zentrum des Dionysoskults seit den Attaliden s. BURKERT, "Bacchic Teletai", 264-265. Im Gegenzug wählte Augustus den Apollo, der in der Antike z. B. in Delphi auch als "Gegenüber" zum Dionysos verehrt wurde, zu seinem persönlichen "Leitstern", durch dessen Hilfe er den Sieg von Actium errang. In Rom begannen die Triumphzüge beim Apollotempel außerhalb des Pomeriums und endeten beim Jupitertempel auf dem Kapitol. Apollo erscheint als Sender des Triumphzugs, Jupiter als dessen Empfänger, Bacchus (Dionysos) aber als der eigentliche Gott des Triumphzuges.

⁽²⁴⁾ Er lebte als Geisel ungefähr zehn Jahre in Rom (ab 189/188 v. Chr.).

⁽²⁵⁾ Dazu O. KERN, "Ein vergessenes Dionysosfest in Jerusalem", *ARW* 22 (1923-1924) 198-199 und LABAHN, *Jesus als Lebensspender*, 155 Anm. 186.

gehören, und ihm gerade durch Tanz huldigen⁽²⁶⁾, stehen hier deutlich im Hintergrund. Weil dieser Tanz in einer trancenhaften Raserei geschah, wurden sie in Ableitung vom Verb "rasen"/ μαινόμεναι als Mänaden oder als Bacchantinnen⁽²⁷⁾ bezeichnet. Überhaupt gehörte die Raserei unmittelbar zur Dionysosverehrung⁽²⁸⁾. Festumzüge für Dionysos waren bei den Diadochen beliebt. Allerdings kann bei der jüdischen Übernahme dionysischer Motive für festliche Begehungen auch eine gewisse Abgrenzung festgestellt werden, da hier nicht von Raserei und nicht von Efeu- oder Weinlaubkränzen, sondern von solchen aus Olivenzweigen die Rede ist. Sowohl Tacitus (*Hist.* 5,5) als auch Plutarch (*Quaestiones Convivales* 4,671d-672b) berichten über den bacchantischen Charakter von Feierlichkeiten am Jerusalemer Tempel⁽²⁹⁾.

Das dritte Makkabäerbuch erzählt, wie die Juden Ägyptens vom Bacchus-Verehrer Ptolemäus IV (222-204 v. Chr.)⁽³⁰⁾ zur Dionysosverehrung gezwungen wurden und wie ihr Gott sie rettete: Ptolemäus befahl, daß alle Juden, die sich weigerten, an Opferhandlungen teilzunehmen, mit dem dionysischen Zeichen des Efeublatts gebrandmarkt werden sollten. Juden, die freiwillig den dionysischen Mysterien beitreten würden, versprach er das Bürgerrecht (3 Makk 2,29-30). Als nächsten Schritt plante er die Vernichtung aller ägyptischen Juden. Einen ersten Vernichtungsversuch vereitelte Gott, indem er dem Ptolemäus nach dem Weingelage süßen und tiefen Schlaf sandte, so daß dieser zu spät aufwachte (3 Makk 5,3.11-12). In den Bacchantinnen des Euripides wird der Weingott als Spender des Schlafes gerühmt. Er ist dort auch derjenige, der durch den Weingenuß Vergessen verursacht (Euripides, *Bacch.* 282). Weitere Versuche des Ptolemäus durchkreuzte Gott, indem er ihn nach durchzechter Nacht von einem vollständigen Vergessen befallen ließ (3 Makk 5,16-17.22.27-28), ihm den Verstand nahm (3 Makk 5,30-31) und ihn so als verrückt erscheinen ließ. Gott richtete die Raserei der Elephanten gegen diejenigen, die sie zwecks Zertrampelung der Juden mit Wein

⁽²⁶⁾ Z. B. Euripides, *Bacch.* 220.

⁽²⁷⁾ Von βακχεύω: rasen; berauscht sein.

⁽²⁸⁾ Z. B. Euripides, *Bacch.* 305.

⁽²⁹⁾ W.R. TELFORD, "More fruit from the withered tree: Temple and fig-tree in Mark from a Graeco-Roman perspective", *Templum Amicitiae* (Hrsg. W. HORBURY) (Sheffield 1991) 264-304, 286-287.

⁽³⁰⁾ Dazu A. MOMIGLIANO, "The Romans and the Maccabees", *Jewish History. Essays in Honour of Chimen Abramsky* (Hrsg. A. RAPOPORT – ALBERT – St.J. ZIPPERSTEIN) (London 1988) 240.

und Weihrauch rasend gemacht hatten (3 Makk 6,21). Der Bacchus des Euripides machte Agaue, die ihm nicht huldigen wollte, durch Raserei gefügig und ließ sie ihren Sohn Pentheus, der sich ihm ebenfalls entgegengestellt hatte, zerreißen (Euripides, *Bacch.* 1110-1139). Wenn der Judenhaß des Ptolemäus durch das geheimnisvolle Wirken Gottes plötzlich in tiefes Mitleid und Freundschaft umschwingt (3 Makk 6,22), dann muß man an den Dionysosverfolger Pentheus denken, der durch den Gott mittels eines Stimmungsumschwungs dazu gebracht wird, sich als Bacchantin zu verkleiden (Euripides, *Bacch.* 830-838). Die Juden schwärmten nach erfolgter Rettung und nach dem Anstimmen des Hallelujas aus, töteten ihre abtrünnigen Landsleute und begingen dies mit einem Freudentag. Die Rettung feierten sie mit Wein des Königs bei Weingelagen und errichteten am Ort ihres Symposions eine Proseuche (3 Makk 6,30-36; 7,18-20)⁽³¹⁾. Schließlich befahl der König, daß ganz Ägypten den jüdischen Gott als den höchsten Gott anerkennen soll (3 Makk 7,9). Auch der jüdische Gott hat hier einen Siegeszug durch die hellenistische Welt gemacht. Die genaue Datierung dieses Buches ist umstritten. Doch offensichtlich machte es irgendwann einmal zwischen 100 v. und 50 n. Chr. Sinn⁽³²⁾, den jüdischen Gott als Spender des Schlafes, Sender des Wahns, Raserei einsetzenden und beim Weingelage wahre Festfreude vermittelnden Gott dem Dionysos überbietend gegenüberzustellen⁽³³⁾.

Die Juden Palästinas waren vom Dionysoskult gewissermaßen "umzingelt". In einer bei Archilles Tattius (Leucippe and Clitophon 816-817) greifbaren Legende schenkt Dionysos bei Tyrus einem Bauern den Wein. Dieser fragt den Gott: Woher, mein Freund, hast Du so rotes Wasser? Wo hast Du so süßes Blut gefunden?" Die Samariterin spricht in Joh 4,11: "Woher hast du dann lebendiges Wasser?" Nach Herodot haben Phönizier den Kult dieses Gottes nach

⁽³¹⁾ Zur Ähnlichkeit der jüdischen Weingelage mit denen des Dionysosfreundes Ptolemäus s. a. 4,16; 5,36; 6,33.

⁽³²⁾ Nach J.J. COLLINS, *Between Athens and Jerusalem. Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (Grand Rapids MI 2000) 122-131, in Alexandrien zur Zeit des Caligula um 40 n. Chr. entstanden.

⁽³³⁾ Weitere dionysische Züge des jüdischen Gottes in 3 Makk: Nachdem der Bacchus-Verehrer Ptolemäus IV das Allerheiligste betreten hatte, züchtigte ihn Gott, indem er ihn durchschüttelte und gelähmt auf den Boden warf (3 Makk 2,21-22). Später fesselte Gott, indem er zwei Engel sandte, durch Furcht das feindliche Heer mit unbeweglichen Fesseln (3 Makk 6,19). Der seine Feinde im Kampf fesselnde Dionysos begegnet in der antiken Mythologie (Nonnus, *Dionysiaka* 36, 356-386).

Griechenland gebracht⁽³⁴⁾. Durch die interpretatio graeca und romana wurden verschiedene Hauptgötter aus dieser Region mit Dionysos identifiziert, so der ägyptische Osiris, der arabische Orontal und der nabatäische Dusares⁽³⁵⁾. Dionysos spielt in den Gründungslegenden von Nysa-Scythopolis (Beth Shean)⁽³⁶⁾, Raphia und Damaskus eine wichtige Rolle. Im ersten Jh. n. Chr. lebte die zweitgrößte jüdische Gemeinde Coelesyriens in Beth Shean, die größte in Caesarea Maritima. Archäologische und numismatische Zeugnisse aus Caesarea⁽³⁷⁾, Aelia Capitolina, Diopolis (Lod), Aschkelon, Aschdod, Gaza, Samaria, Canatha im Hauran, Capitolias (nördlich von Irbid), Gadara, Hesbon, Tyrus, Sidon, Berytus und aus anderen Städten dieser Region belegen die Verbreitung des Dionysoskults in dieser Region⁽³⁸⁾.

Auch der Gott Israels wurde von Nichtjuden mit Dionysos identifiziert. Plutarch (*Quaestiones Convivales* 4,671c-672b) akzeptiert diese Identifikation. Tacitus, *Hist.* 5,5,5 kennt sie, weist sie aber zurück⁽³⁹⁾. Auch das Alte Testament ist nicht frei von Parallelen zu Weingottheiten⁽⁴⁰⁾, wie z. B. der Judasegen in Gen 49 zeigt, wo der

⁽³⁴⁾ Herodot, 2,49,3.

⁽³⁵⁾ Herodot, 3,8,1; Arrian, *Anabasis* 7,20; Strabo, 16,1,11. Bei Diodorus Siculus, 3,65,7 wird der Kampf zwischen Dionysos und König Lykurgus in einem arabischen Nysa lokalisiert.

⁽³⁶⁾ Plinius, *Historia Naturalis* 5,74; Münzen seit dem 1. Jh. v. Chr.; zu Dionysos in Beth Shean s. A. OVADIAH, "Greek cults in Beth-Shean/Scythopolis in the Hellenistic and Roman periods" (Hebrew, with English summary S. 122), *Nelson Glueck memorial volume. Israel Exploration Society* (Jerusalem 1975) 116-124; Y. TORNHEIM – A. OVADIAH, "Dionysos in Beth Shean" (hebr.), *Cathedra* 71 (1994) 21-34; J.-M. NIETO IBAÑEZ, "The Sacred Grove of Scythopolis (Flavius Josephus, Jewish War II 466-471)", *IEJ* 49 (1999) 260-268; L. DI SEGNI – G. FOERSTER – Y. TSAFRIR, "The Basilica and an Altar to Dionysos at Nysa-Scythopolis", *The Roman and Byzantine Near East* (Hrsg. J.H. HUMPHREY) (Portsmouth 1999) II, 59-75.

⁽³⁷⁾ Zu den dionysischen Sarkophagreliefs aus Caesarea (2./3. Jh. n. Chr.) s. R. GERSHT, "Dionysiac Sarcophagi from Caesarea Maritima", *IEJ* 41 (1991) 145-156.

⁽³⁸⁾ Übersicht in *Dionysos and His Retinue in the Art of Eretz-Israel* (Hrsg. R. ROSENTHAL–HEGINBOTTOM) (Haifa 1998) 10-19; s. SMITH, *Wine God*, 231.233. Pausanias hörte von einem Grab eines Silenus in Palästina (6,24,8).

⁽³⁹⁾ Smith nennt Indizien aus dem vierten und dritten Jahrhundert v. Chr., die auf eine solche Identifizierung durch Juden selber hinweisen (SMITH, *Wine God*, 231-233).

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Vgl. SMITH, *Wine God*, 234-237 ("Weintraube der Kundschafter"); G.R.H. WRIGHT, "Joseph's Grave under the Tree by the Omphalos at Shechem", *VT* 22 (1972) 476-486, bes. 483-485: Josephus als Dionysos- und Christustyp (s.

Herrscher eng mit dem Weintrinken verbunden wird (Gen 49,11-12). Valerius Maximus berichtet von Juden Italiens um 139 v. Chr., die den Herrn Zebaoth unter dem Namen des oft mit Dionysos gleichgesetzten Iovis (Juppiter) Sabazius verehrten⁽⁴¹⁾. Diese Gleichsetzung wurde wahrscheinlich durch den Gleichklang von Jovis Sabazius und JHWH Zebaoth gefördert. Auf einer 55 v. Chr. geprägten römischen Münze wird der Sieg über einen orientalischen Bacchius Iudaeus gefeiert⁽⁴²⁾. Münzen des Antigonus Mattathias (40-37 v. Chr.) zeigen Efeukränze und Trauben⁽⁴³⁾. Aber auch jüdische Münzen aus der Zeit der beiden Aufstände zeigen dionysische Motive. Solche bleiben nicht nur in der jüdischen Kunst noch lange präsent⁽⁴⁴⁾, sondern finden auch Eingang in die Haggada. Die großen Tempel aus römischer Zeit im Vorderen Orient, wie z. B. der sogenannte Bacchustempel in Baalbek oder der Beltempel in Palmyra, sind besonders in ihrem Eingangsbereich mit Weinblätter- und Traubenreliefs verziert. Tacitus, Josephus und der Talmud berichten, daß im Eingangsbereich des Jerusalemer Tempels ein monumentaler Weinstock aus Gold aufgestellt war, der bei besonderen Festen mit Trauben und Weinblättern geschmückt wurde (Tacitus, *Hist.* 5,5,5; Josephus, *Bell.* 5,4; Josephus, *Ant.* 15,395; bTMiddoth 3,8). Es dürfte klar sein, was dieser für Assoziationen wenigstens bei nichtjüdischen Besuchern wecken konnte, die die großen Tempel des hellenistisch-römischen Orients kannten. Offensichtlich gab es einerseits eine *interpretatio graeca* des jüdischen Gottes mit Dionysos, die wenigstens für gewisse jüdische Kreise zu gewissen Zeiten attraktiv war. Andererseits konnte der Kyrios als der einzige Gott dargestellt werden, der auch in dionysischer Hinsicht den Dionysos in den Schatten stellte. Im Folgenden möchte ich zeigen, daß eine solche Strategie im Johannesevangelium mit dem inkarnierten Logos Gottes verfolgt wird.

a. Koran Sura 12); O. MARGALITH, "The Kelabim of Ahab", *VT* 34 (1984) 228-232 zur Verbreitung des Cybele/Dionysoskults unter Jesebel in Israel.

(41) Valerius Maximus 1.3.2: "Iudaeos qui Sabazi Iovis cultu Romanos inficere mores conati erant repetere domos suas coegit"; Interpretation bei MOMIGLIANO, "Romans", 242-244.

(42) MOMIGLIANO, "Romans", 241.

(43) A. REIFENBERG, *Ancient Jewish Coins* (Jerusalem 1947) 42.

(44) E.R. GOODENOUGH, *Jewish Symbols in the Graeco-Roman Period* (New York 1953-1968). Bemerkenswert ist auch, daß das berühmte Bacchusrelief von Sepphoris, das in einem wahrscheinlich heidnischen Haus gefunden worden ist, aus der Zeit stammt, als Rabbi Juda dort die Mishna redigierte; dazu R. TALGAM, "Dionysos in the Mosaics of Eretz-Israel", *Dionysos and His Retinue*, 28-30.

3. Jesus gegen Dionysos bei Johannes

Auch der Gott Israels wurde von Nichtjuden mit Dionysos identifiziert. Plutarch (*Quaestiones Convivales* 4,671c-672b) akzeptiert diese Identifikation. Tacitus, *Hist.* 5,5,5 wenigstens ehemalige Anhängerinnen und Anhänger des Dionysos werden hier eine eigene "Melodie" gehört haben. Bacchus ist Sohn einer irdischen Mutter und des höchsten Gottes Zeus, aber dennoch im Unterschied zu anderen Göttersöhnen nicht nur ein Heros, sondern ganz Gott. Seine Mutter ist Theotokos (Euripides, *Bacch.* 335: θεόν τεκεῖν). Ausgerechnet in seiner Geburtsstadt wird ihm von der Schwester seiner Mutter und deren Sohn Pentheus nicht die Ehre gegeben. Als er in der Gestalt eines Menschen in seine Heimat kommt, wird er — wie der inkarnierte Logos bei Johannes — von den Eigenen nicht aufgenommen⁽⁴⁵⁾.

In Joh 1,14 heißt es: "Und das Wort wurde Fleisch und wohnte unter uns, und wir sahen seine Herrlichkeit". Die Kana-Perikope beginnt ganz ähnlich: "Und am dritten Tage war eine Hochzeit in Kana in Galiläa". Viele Exegeten meinen, daß das Wasser den Logos symbolisiert und deshalb die Wandlung zu Wein die Fleischwerdung spiegelt⁽⁴⁶⁾. Weder die Herkunft des Inkarnierten noch die des Weins wird von allen erkannt. Durch das Weinwunder offenbarte Jesus seine schon in 1,14 verheißene Herrlichkeit und seine Jünger glaubten an ihn (Joh 2,11). Wer sich auf den sich oft durch Wein-Epiphanyen offenbarenden Dionysos einließ, trat in sein Gefolge ein und ließ sich weihen (Ovidius, *Met.* 3.690-691). Wer sich aber weigerte, den Gott zu ehren, der wurde durch ihn grausam gerichtet⁽⁴⁷⁾. "Wer aber nicht glaubt, der ist schon gerichtet", sagt Jesus in Joh 3,18. Nathanael anerkennt Jesus aufgrund seiner Prophetie als Sohn Gottes (Joh 1,47-49; vgl. Joh 4,19.29). Prophetie wurde bei den Griechen eng mit der dionysischen Raserei verbunden. Schon Platon sagte μανικὴ μαντική (Platon, *Phaidr.* 244b-d).

⁽⁴⁵⁾ So lassen sich in Beiträgen zu Dionysos sogar johanneisch beeinflusste Wendungen entdecken, z. B. J.M. DILLON, "Dionysus", *AncB Dictionary* (Hrsg. D.N. FREEDMAN) (New York u. a. 1992) II, 201-202: "Dionysus comes into his own as a god in Greece only in the Archaic Age".

⁽⁴⁶⁾ LÜTGEHETMANN, *Hochzeit von Kana*, 309-310; T.L. BRODIE, *The Gospel According to John. A Literary and Theological Commentary* (New York – Oxford 1993) 476-477; G. KEIL, *Das Johannesevangelium. Ein philosophischer Kommentar* (Göttingen 1997) 55, 58-59; LABAHN, *Jesus als Lebensspender*, 142.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Nach Euripides, *Bacch.* 847 mußte Pentheus durch seinen Tod Buße leisten.

Die Samariterin am Brunnen spricht zu Jesus (Joh 4,11): "Herr, hast du doch nichts, womit du schöpfen könntest, und der Brunnen ist tief; woher hast du dann lebendiges Wasser?" Der Bauer in der tyrischen Dionysoslegende bei Archillos Tattius (Leucippe and Clitophon 816) sagt zu Bacchus beinahe wörtlich dasselbe: "Woher, mein Freund, hast Du so rotes Wasser? Wo hast Du so süßes Blut gefunden?"⁽⁴⁸⁾.

Das Meer ist in der Mythologie des Dionysos wichtiger Herkunftsort seiner Epiphanie und Schauplatz seiner Wunder (Homer, *Hymni* 7,35-53). Auch die Perikope von Jesu Gang auf dem Wasser müßte man in dieser Hinsicht genauer untersuchen. Wenn die Jünger bei Mt und Mk erschrecken, weil sie Jesus für ein Gespenst halten, so täuschen sie sich bei Johannes nicht, sondern erkennen Jesus. Sie erschrecken aber, weil sie in diesem Geschehen eine Epiphanie Gottes erkennen⁽⁴⁹⁾. Gott ist in alttestamentlicher Tradition derjenige, der sich einen Weg auf dem Meer bahnt (Ps 77,20). Jesus unterstreicht noch mit den Worten 'Εγώ εἰμι den epiphanen Charakter⁽⁵⁰⁾. In der Geschichte von den tyrrenischen Seeräubern offenbart sich Dionysos auf dem Meer durch Wunder, löst dadurch auch bei demjenigen, der an seine Göttlichkeit glaubt, Furcht und Schrecken aus und fordert ihn auf — wie Jesus im Evangelium die Jünger —, sich nicht zu fürchten (Joh 6,18-21; Ovidius, *Met.* 3,582-691; bes. 688-691; vgl. Homer, *Hymni* 7,1-55).

In der Brotrede ist der Zusammenhang mit dem Manna offensichtlich, das Gott Israel in der Wüste gegeben hat (Ps 78,24). In Joh 6,51-59 wird aber der Rahmen der Wüstenwanderung gesprengt, indem das Brot als das Fleisch Christi gedeutet und mit dem Trinken des Blutes Christi verbunden wird. "Wenn ihr nicht das Fleisch des Menschensohns eßt und sein Blut trinkt, so habt ihr kein Leben in euch". In der paganen Frömmigkeit wurde die Brotgöttin Demeter oft eng mit dem Weingott Dionysos verbunden⁽⁵¹⁾. Zurecht wurde immer wieder darauf hingewiesen, daß der Wein von Kana symbolisch schon das Blut Christi vorwegnimmt. Die Gleichsetzung von Blut mit Wein

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Auf diese Parallele verweist SMITH, *Wine God*, 228.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ Vgl. WENGST, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 225-226: Die Jünger erkennen Jesus.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Vgl. Joh 18,6; WENGST, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 225: "Damit stellt ihn Johannes in der Dimension Gottes dar, der seinen Weg auch auf dem Meer nimmt, und denen, die er retten will, einen Weg durchs Wasser gibt".

⁽⁵¹⁾ Zur engen Verbindung der Brotgöttin Demeter mit dem Weingott s. z. B. Euripides, *Bacch.* 275-279; von den Römern wurde Liber/Dionysos zusammen mit Libera/Kore und Ceres/Demeter als Trias verehrt.

begegnet immer wieder. In Offb 17,6 ist die Hure Babylon betrunken von dem Blut der Heiligen. Das Blut ist der Rauschtrank. Wein wird nicht nur im Alten Testament, sondern auch in dionysischen Legenden als Blut der Trauben bezeichnet (Gen 49,11; Dtn 32,14; Achilles Tatiuss, 2,2,4). Bacchus ist im Wein präsent, er wird in den Becher gegossen (Ovidius, *Met.* 6,488: “et Bacchus in auro ponitur”) und getrunken und er gilt deshalb als der einzige Gott, der mit der Weinlibation anderen Göttern geopfert beziehungsweise zum Trank gespendet wird. Dadurch haben die Menschen Anteil an den guten Gaben der Götter (Euripides, *Bacch.* 284-285). Der Wein ist gewissermaßen sein Blut⁽⁵²⁾. Bei Euripides (*Bacch.* 135) trinkt Dionysos selbst Blut und ißt rohes Fleisch. Die harte Rede vom “Fleisch kauen”, das notwendig ist, um am Heil Jesu Anteil zu haben, kann durchaus Assoziationen an das Essen von rohem Fleisch (Omophagie) zerrissener Tiere (Sparagmos) wecken, wie es von den Anhängerinnen des Dionysos überliefert worden ist⁽⁵³⁾.

In der Mythologie ist Bacchus immer ein wenigstens graduell leidensfähiger Gott. Oft läßt sich Dionysos gefangennehmen (Euripides, *Bacch.* 434-442; Ovidius, *Met.* 3,605-635). Aber es gibt auch den Mythos, daß das Dionysoskind beim Spielen mit einem Spiegel von den Titanen getötet worden ist und in Teile zerlegt wurde⁽⁵⁴⁾, oder von Dionysos als der Vegetationsgottheit, die stirbt und zu neuem Leben kommt⁽⁵⁵⁾. Auch wenn ein eigentlicher

⁽⁵²⁾ So D. OBBINK, “Dionysus Poured Out: Ancient and Modern Theories of Sacrifice and Cultural Formation”, *Masks of Dionysus*, 65-86, 78-79, der allerdings darauf hinweist, daß der als Blut dieses Gottes getrunkene Wein nicht zugleich mit der Vorstellung verbunden sein muß, daß dieser Gott dafür geopfert worden wäre (s. auch S. 83-84).

⁽⁵³⁾ Euripides, *Bacch.* 735. Der Tod durch Sparagmos des Pentheus wird als Opfer bezeichnet (Euripides, *Bacch.* 1246-1247). Zum Problem der Omophagie s. OBBINK, “Dionysus”, 68-72, der davon ausgeht, daß Omophagie — wenn überhaupt — nur sehr selten praktiziert worden ist. Zum kultischen Blutgenuß von Dionysosanhängern s. MARGALITH, “Kelabim”, 230 (vgl. Lukian 4,15,51-52).

⁽⁵⁴⁾ Zur philosophischen Rezeption dieser Tradition s. Plutarch, *De E apud Delphos* 9,388F-389B: Dieser Mythos symbolisiert bei den Stoikern die zyklische Selbstverwandlung Gottes von dem reinen göttlichen Feuer in die wechselhafte Vielheit der Welt; die dionysische Kraft symbolisiert die Bewegung hin zur Vielheit der Teile, die apollinische diejenige zur Einheit im Feuer. Zur Aufnahme dieser Tradition durch Paulus s. 1 Kor 13,9-12 (vgl. R. SEAFORD, “In the Mirror of Dionysos”, *The Sacred and the Feminine in Ancient Greece* [Hrsg. S. BLUNDELL – M. WILLIAMSON] [New York 1998] 140-141).

⁽⁵⁵⁾ Nach DILLON, “Dionysus”, 201 wurde Dionysos in Phrygien als Diounisis verehrt, eine Vegetationsgottheit, die starb und auferstand.

Auferstehungsglauben erst durch die Auseinandersetzung mit dem Christentum auf Dionysos übertragen wurde, hofften schon lange vor der christlichen Zeit diejenigen, die sich dem Dionysos weihen ließen, dadurch auf eine Verbesserung ihrer Situation im Totenreich⁽⁵⁶⁾. Überhaupt war der für die überschäumende Lebensfreude stehende Gott eng mit dem Tod verbunden. Ein Grab von ihm wurde in Delphi verehrt (Kallimachos, *Fr.* 643). "Ich bin die Auferstehung und das Leben", sagt Jesus im vierten Evangelium und gibt schon jetzt allen Glaubenden Anteil an der Lebenskraft, die den Tod überwunden hat (Joh 11,25)⁽⁵⁷⁾. Wenn am Kreuz Wasser und Blut aus der Seite Jesu fließt (Joh 19,34), wird man durch die Wein-Blutsymbolik daran erinnert, daß das Wasser in Wein verwandelt wurde und daß der Wein in der Antike in der Regel mit Wasser vermischt getrunken wurde⁽⁵⁸⁾.

Allerdings, wenn Dionysos nicht wollte, konnte niemand Hand an ihn legen. Er erschreckte seine Häscher durch Epiphanien oder verschwand vor den Augen seiner Feinde (Euripides, *Bacch.* 616-647; Homer, *Hymni* 7,35-44; Ovidius, *Met.* 3,660-669). Auch dieses wunderhafte Moment taucht im Johannesevangelium auf: "Da hoben sie Steine auf, um auf ihn zu werfen. Aber Jesus verbarg sich und ging zum Tempel hinaus" (Joh 8,59; vgl. 7,30; 8,20). Wahrscheinlich mußte deshalb in diesem Evangelium zur Festnahme Jesu eine ganze Kohorte (600 Mann) aufgeboten werden (Joh 18,3). Als Jesus jedoch die epiphanen Worte 'Εγώ εἰμι spricht, fallen diese alle um (Joh 18,6).

Die Rede vom Weinstock und den Reben in Joh 15,1-8 strotzt vor dionysischer Symbolik. Dies wurde kaum je beachtet⁽⁵⁹⁾, obwohl viele die Nähe dieser Rede zum Weinwunder festgestellt haben. Auch wenn im Alten Testament Israel als Weinstock bezeichnet werden kann (Psalm 80,9; Jer 2,21; Hes 17,1-10; Hos 10,1; Joel 1,7), so erinnert

⁽⁵⁶⁾ So pointiert S.G. COLE, "Voices from beyond the Grave: Dionysus and the Dead", *Masks of Dionysus*, 276-295, 295; weiterführend F. GRAF, "Dionysian and Orphic Eschatology. New Texts and Old Questions", *Masks of Dionysus*, 239-258.

⁽⁵⁷⁾ Mit dem auf sich selber bezogenen Wort vom Weizenkorn, das sterben muß, um Frucht zu bringen (Joh 12,24), wird eine Naturmetaphorik zu Tod und neuem Leben aufgegriffen, die vor allem in den eleusinischen Demetermysterien eine große Rolle spielte. Hippolyt, *Elenchos* 5,8,39: Das große, wunderbare, vollkommenste Mysterium war in Eleusis eine geerntete Ähre.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ Zur Verbindung des mit Wasser vermischten Weins mit Dionysos in Attika s. OBBINK, "Dionysus", 81-83.

⁽⁵⁹⁾ Ausnahme: J. LEIPOLDT, *Von den Mysterien zur Kirche* (Hamburg – Bergstedt 1962) 243.

diese metaphorische Rede doch an Darstellungen des Dionysos, der vor sich den Weinstock als seine Gabe hält, unter dessen ausladenden Reben seine Anhängerinnen und Anhänger tanzen. Gott selbst tritt im vierten Evangelium als Sender des wahren Weinstocks und als Weingärtner auf, der Weinstock selber ist Jesus, seine Anhänger sind die Reben. Diesen Reben wird über das verbindende Wort vom Bleiben zugesagt, daß sie vollkommene Freude haben, wenn sie in Liebe in Jesus bleiben. Jesus als Weinstock ist also für seine Reben Quell und Garant von Liebe und vollkommener Freude (15,9-11). Anhänger des Dionysos suchten durch Ekstase aus sich herauszutreten und im Enthusiasmus zu erleben, wie die Gottheit in sie besitzergreifend eindringt, um so von deren Freude und Lebenskraft erfüllt zu werden. Könnte nicht auch im folgenden Wort — in allerdings das Element der Raserei brechender Form — etwas von Ekstase als aus sich Heraustreten in die Gottheit hinein und von Enthusiasmus als Hineindringen der Gottheit in seine Anhänger mitklingen: "Wer in mir bleibt und ich in ihm, der bringt viel Frucht" (Joh 15,5)? Gerade bei Joh 15 müßte gefragt werden, ob in der Antike überhaupt jemand eine Weinstockmetapher in einen solch engen semantischen Zusammenhang zur Liebes- und Freudethematik bringen konnte, ohne nicht sofort auch an Dionysos zu denken⁽⁶⁰⁾.

Doch nun zurück nach Kana: Hier will Jesus zuerst nicht auf seine Mutter eingehen, weil seine Stunde noch nicht da sei (Joh 2,4). Die Stunde, die kommt, meint bei Johannes immer die Verherrlichung Jesu durch Tod und Auferstehung oder das Eintreten der Konsequenzen aus diesen Ereignissen (4,23; 5,25; 7,30; 8,20; 12,23.27; 13,1; 17,1; 19,27)⁽⁶¹⁾. Gerade in der Verwandlung von Wasser in Wein wird also schon Jesu Tod und Auferstehung sichtbar. Diese Aussageabsicht wird dadurch verstärkt, daß in der Stunde des Weinwunders die Herrlichkeit Jesu offenbar wird (Joh 2,11). "Gekommen ist die Stunde, daß der Menschensohn verherrlicht werde", heißt es in Joh 12,23. Eine auf dionysische Motive achtende Auslegung des vierten Evangeliums wäre also nicht nur deshalb zwingend, weil dem Weinwunder zu Kana als erstem Zeichen eine Schlüsselfunktion gegeben wird, sondern weil dieses Flüssigkeits- und Epiphaniewunder durch äußere und innere

⁽⁶⁰⁾ Bei Euripides spendet der Weingott nicht nur Freude, sondern bietet gewissermaßen die *conditio sine qua non* für die Liebe der Aphrodite (*Bacch.* 703-704; vgl. V. 236; 402-416).

⁽⁶¹⁾ LÜTGEHETMANN, *Hochzeit von Kana*, 232-235; LITTLE, *Wine of Cana*, 46.64.

Verbindungen zugleich programmatisch die Verherrlichung Jesu durch Kreuz und Auferstehung und damit das ganze Evangelium vorwegnimmt⁽⁶²⁾.

Dionysos ist der ortsungebundene, fremde Gott, der sich gerade deshalb oft und in besonderer Weise offenbart. Es ist grundlegend, daß seine Anhänger ihn in seiner menschlichen Form und hinter den Partikularitäten seiner pflanzlichen und tierischen Manifestationen erkennen. Bei Johannes haben viele Zeichenhandlungen einen Epiphanie-Charakter. Die Anhänger Jesu sollen über das Sehen zum Glauben und schließlich zum Glauben ohne Sehen kommen. Unter anderem sollen sie glauben, daß der bis jetzt bei Gott verborgene, für die Menschen fremde Logos sich nun in Christus offenbart hat, und daß dieser das wahre Lamm und der wahre Weinstock Gottes ist. Die parallelisierende und überbietende Gegenüberstellung von Jesus und dionysischen Motiven scheint tatsächlich eine Argumentationsstrategie zu sein, mit der der Evangelist arbeitet und die sich wie ein Netz über das ganze Evangelium ausbreitet. Ob mit dieser Strategie nur gegenüber paganen Dionysosanhängern Propaganda gemacht werden soll, oder ob sie nicht auch innerchristliche und christlich-jüdische Ziele verfolgt, müßte eingehender untersucht werden. Jedenfalls beeinflußt sie die inhaltliche Füllung von Freude, Liebe und anderen Grundwerten dieses Evangeliums auch in qualitativer Hinsicht und fördert die theologische Darstellung der Einheit des Vaters mit dem Sohne durch dessen theophane Züge.

4. *Jesus – Dionysos und die Frauen*

Nun müßte nicht nur dargestellt werden, wie sich diese Strategie zu den unzähligen Verbindungen des Johannes zu alttestamentlichen und frühjüdischen Traditionen — wie sie in jüngster Zeit überzeugend dargestellt wurden⁽⁶³⁾ — verhält, sondern auch dargelegt werden, wo überall von Jesus die dionysischen Motive anders, sublimiert oder sogar gegen den Bacchusmythos erzählt werden. Schließlich ist Jesus kein Rasender. Nur seine Gegner behaupten, er habe einen Dämon und sei rasend (Joh 10,20: *μαίνεται*)⁽⁶⁴⁾.

⁽⁶²⁾ Vgl. BRODIE, *Gospel*, 172-176; LABAHN, *Jesus als Lebensspender*, 123-145.

⁽⁶³⁾ Besonders WENGST, *Das Johannesevangelium*.

⁽⁶⁴⁾ Dies entspricht einer polemischen Weise, über Enthusiasmus und Ekstase zu sprechen.

Die komplizierte und komplexe Nähe des Dionysos zur Erotik ⁽⁶⁵⁾ müßte im Hinblick auf Johannes besonders intensiv aufgearbeitet werden. Schließlich spielen erotische Elemente am ehesten noch im vierten Evangelium eine Rolle. Nur hier wird in einer für die damalige Kultur provokativen Weise von der Liebe eines Mannes zu unverheirateten Frauen gesprochen: "Jesus aber liebte Martha ..." (Joh 11,5). Nur hier spricht Jesus allein mit einer Frau an einer Quelle; hier salbt eine Frau, wie die Geliebte ihrem Liebhaber in einem antiken Liebesroman, Jesus die Füße und trocknet sie mit ihrem gelösten Haar ⁽⁶⁶⁾; nur hier verbietet Jesus einer Frau, ihn in ihrer Wiedersehensfreude zu umarmen ⁽⁶⁷⁾.

Dionysos ist ein Gott der Polaritäten und der Grenzüberschreitungen und Vermischungen der Gegensätze nicht nur von göttlich und menschlich, sondern auch von Tier und Mensch ⁽⁶⁸⁾, Leiden und Lust, Opferobjekt und Opfersubjekt, Stadt und Wildnis, Mann und Frau ⁽⁶⁹⁾. Die Welt des Dionysos ist vor allem eine Welt der Frauen ⁽⁷⁰⁾. Frauen erzogen ihn, waren die ersten, die in sein Gefolge eintraten und von seiner Raserei ergriffen wurden, die ihm Schutz

⁽⁶⁵⁾ Bis heute bleibt es umstritten, wieviel Dionysos mit sexueller Liebe zu tun hat. Obwohl in seinem Umfeld, sowohl in der Mythologie als auch in der Kunst, Sexualität eine große Rolle spielt und der Phallus eines seiner wichtigen Symbole ist, steht er meist dem sexuellen Geschehen unberührt gegenüber. Für eine sehr beschränkte Rolle der Sexualität spricht sich z. B. M. JAMESON, "The Asexuality of Dionysus", *Masks of Dionysus*, 44-64 aus. So schreibt er zur kultischen Verwendung des Phallus: ... "rather supports our contention that in the cults of Dionysus the phallus is left to men" (S. 59). Doch auf dem bacchantischen Freskenzyklus in der villa dei misteri bei Pompeji wird der Phallus von einer Frau enthüllt. Im Bacchanalienskandal spielt die Sexualität eine große Rolle (Livius, 39.13.10-11). In Euripides, *Ion* 550-552 gilt der jugendliche Held als Frucht einer nächtlichen Bacchusfeier.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ Dies ist mit Jer 25,10 LXX im Hintergrund eine Anspielung auf die Hochzeitsthematik; so S. VAN TILBORG, *Imaginative Love in John* (Biblical Interpretation Series 2; Leiden 1993) 196.

⁽⁶⁷⁾ VAN TILBORG, *Imaginative Love*, 170-173.

⁽⁶⁸⁾ Die Satyrn sind solche "Übergangswesen" zwischen Mensch und Tier; dazu F. LISSARRAGUE, "On the Wildness of Satyrs", *Masks of Dionysus*, 207-220.

⁽⁶⁹⁾ W.F. OTTO, *Dionysos*. Mythos und Kultus (Frankfurt a. M. 1933) 113; dazu A. HENRICHS, "'He Has a God in Him'. Human and Divine in the Modern Perception of Dionysus", *Masks of Dionysus*, 29-43. Dionysos Protrygaios ist der Gott von unreif und reif, s. R. KANY, "Dionysos Protrygaios: pagane und christliche Spuren eines antiken Weinfeistes", *JAC* 31 (1988) 17.

⁽⁷⁰⁾ J.T. SANDERS, "Dionysus, Cybele and the 'madness' of women", *Beyond Androcentrism* (Hrsg. R.M. GROSS) (Missoula 1977) 125-137. Im Kult des Dionysos konnte ein ritueller Geschlechterantagonismus ausagiert werden.

boten und die ihn beeinflussten. Schon Semele, die Mutter des Dionysos brachte Zeus dazu, sich ihr in seiner ganzen Herrlichkeit durch einen Blitz zu offenbaren. Die Mutter Jesu bringt ihren Sohn dazu, seine Herrlichkeit zu offenbaren, obwohl er sie zuerst — wie Zeus Semele — zurückweist, weil diese Selbstoffenbarung hier wie dort mit Tod verbunden ist: Hier mit dem Tod des Sohns am Kreuz zu "seiner" Stunde (Joh 2,4.11), dort mit dem Tod der Mutter durch den Blitz. Überhaupt zeigt die narrative Untersuchung von Sief van Tilborg, daß es im vierten Evangelium gerade Frauen wie die Samariterin, Martha, ihre Schwester Maria und Maria von Magdala sind, die immer wieder eine für die Handlung entscheidende Rolle übernehmen und den Fortgang der Erzählung maßgeblich beeinflussen. Die Samariterin am Brunnen wirkt aktiv auf den Gesprächsverlauf ein und macht die Reise Jesu nach Samarien zu einem Erfolg (Joh 4). Martha holt Jesus wieder in das Gefahrengebiet Jerusalem zurück, aus dem er vorsichtshalber gewichen ist und spielt mit ihrer Schwester Maria eine wichtige Rolle bei der Auferweckung ihres Bruders Lazarus. Maria nimmt aus eigener Initiative die Totensalbung Jesu vorweg und prophezeit so seinen Tod noch vor den Abschiedsreden. Maria von Magdala ist die erste, die den Auferstandenen sieht und von Jesus den Auftrag erhält, seine Auferstehung zu bezeugen (Joh 20,17-18)⁽⁷¹⁾.

Im Kult des Dionysos kommt den Frauen eine Vorrangstellung zu, was in der Antike gegenüber einer männlichen Gottheit eine Ausnahme bedeutet. In der Raserei kommt es zur Überschreitung oder sogar Umkehrung der zugeschriebenen Geschlechterrollen. Dionysos kann sogar als Zerstörer des "oikos" gelten⁽⁷²⁾. Die Mänaden des Euripides lassen Haus und Herd im Stich (*Bacch.* 217) und jagen und kämpfen (*Bacch.* 733; 752-764; 848; 977; 1144; 1181-1191). Männer konnten in diese Frauendomäne nur eindringen, indem sie eine weibliche Geschlechterrolle übernahmen⁽⁷³⁾. Sogar Pentheus verkleidete sich unter dem Einfluß des Dionysos als Mänade. Seit dem fünften Jahrhundert vor Christus kommt es in der Kunst zu einer

⁽⁷¹⁾ VAN TILBORG, *Imaginative Love*, 168.

⁽⁷²⁾ R. SEAFORD, "Dionysus as Destroyer of the household: Homer, Tragedy, and the Polis", *Masks of Dionysus*, 115-146.

⁽⁷³⁾ SEAFORD, "Mirror of Dionysos", 129, 133. Zur schleichenden patriarchalen Unterwanderung des Dionysoskults um den Preis der Verweiblichung der Männer s. SANDERS, "Dionysus, Cybele", 129-133 mit Verweis auf ein ähnliches Phänomen bei den Galli der Kybele.

Effeminierung in der bildlichen Darstellung des Dionysos⁽⁷⁴⁾. Auch die aktiven Frauen des vierten Evangeliums überschreiten die ihnen gerade durch die herrschende Oikosideologie zugewiesene Geschlechterrolle wiederholt, indem sie im Hinblick auf diese Rolle viel zu frei handeln, zu unabhängig von Männern und zugleich zu offen gegenüber diesen sind. Die Samariterin übernimmt aufgrund der Begegnung mit Jesus eine männlich konnotierte Rolle und verkündigt in publico in ihrer Stadt den Christus. Damit wird sie früher als die Jünger zur ersten Volksmissionarin (Joh 4). Im Verlauf des Gesprächs wird Jesus vom Mann, der eine Frau für sich Wasser schöpfen läßt, zu demjenigen, der dasselbe — im Tausch der Rollen — einer Frau anbietet. Maria Magdalena erhält durch die Begegnung mit Jesus wenigstens temporär eine Vorrangstellung vor den Jüngern, denen gegenüber sie als Auferstehungs- und Bundesverkündigerin (ἀγγέλουσα) vorangehen soll (Joh 20,17-19)⁽⁷⁵⁾.

Sicher, Frauen spielen im Gefolge Jesu nicht dieselbe Rolle wie die Mänaden in der Gefolgschaft des Dionysos. Dennoch ist es weiterer Untersuchungen wert, daß sie ausgerechnet in diesem in Auseinandersetzung mit dem Dionysoskult stehenden Evangelium besonders unabhängige, einflußreiche und auch öffentliche Rollen spielen. In diesem Zusammenhang müssen auch die Effeminierungstendenzen in der Darstellung des Lieblingsjüngers näher untersucht werden.

*
* *

Quellenlage, Numismatik und archäologische Befunde sprechen eine eindeutige Sprache für die Bedeutung des Dionysos in Palästina und Syrien während vieler Jahrhunderte vor und nach Christus. Es ist an der Zeit, unter Rezeption der vielen Arbeiten, die schon geleistet wurden, diesen historischen Hintergrund interdisziplinär zu rekonstruieren. Jüdische und christliche Identität entwickelte sich in jener Zeit maßgeblich im Raum der dominanten hellenistischen Kultur. Juden und Christen konnten als Minderheiten ihre Identität nur repräsentieren, indem sie sich innerhalb der vom mainstream des

⁽⁷⁴⁾ Dazu ausführlich Th.H. CARPENTER, "On the Beardless Dionysus", *Masks of Dionysus*, 185-206.

⁽⁷⁵⁾ So VAN TILBORG, *Imaginative Love*, 171-208 mit überzeugender Argumentation.

Hellenismus geprägten symbolischen Ordnung äußerten⁽⁷⁶⁾. Die johanneischen Gemeinden bilden eine deviante jüdische Gruppe, die in eine Distanz geraten ist zu den Pharisäern, die mit ihrem Programm der kulturellen Abgrenzung gegenüber dem Hellenismus nach der Tempelzerstörung einen prägenden Einfluß auf das Judentum gewonnen haben. Die johanneische Theologie mit ihrer eigenwilligen Rezeption und kritischen Integration hellenistisch-römischer Deutungsschemata steht nicht in dieser, sondern in einer anderen, alten Tradition jüdischer Strategien, mit dem Hellenismus umzugehen und sich in dessen Rahmen u. a. durch eine Dionysierung des Gottesbildes zu profilieren.

Offensichtlich wird im Johannesevangelium hintergründig eine Auseinandersetzung mit dem Dionysoskult greifbar. Dadurch öffnet sich aber — wie hier nur knapp gezeigt werden konnte — eine Tür, um das vierte Evangelium, aber auch andere frühchristliche Strömungen so im Judentum zu kontextualisieren, daß die Verankerung und enge Verflechtung von Frühjudentum und frühem Christentum in der paganen Umwelt deutlicher wird und für die Exegese und Theologie fruchtbar gemacht werden kann. Denn letztlich geht es dabei um die heute wieder drängende Frage nach dem Verhältnis von Evangelium und Kultur beziehungsweise von Evangelium und hybriden Kulturen.

Evangelisch-Theologische Fakultät
Ruhr-Universität Bochum

Peter WICK

D-44780 Bochum Universitätsstr. 150, GA 8/148

SUMMARY

The author of the article intends to show, that not just the episode of the "miracle at Cana" (John 2,1-11), but the gospel of John as a whole disputes in an implicit way the worship of Dionysos, which was wide-spread in Syria and Palestine. Jesus is presented as the true son of god, who surpasses the god Dionysos in every way. John represents the old Jewish tradition of disputing the worship of Dionysos. This dispute implies the rejection as well as the surpassing adoption of Dionysian elements. The author of the gospel strengthens the identity of his communities, which are confronted by the Hellenistic world, by arguing as a scripture-rooted Jew within the symbolic world of the Hellenistic mainstream.

⁽⁷⁶⁾ "Für jede Subkultur und Minoritätengruppe ist die Repräsentation ihrer Identität schwierig, weil sie sich innerhalb von symbolischen Ordnungen äußern muß, die entscheidend vom Diskurs der dominanten Kulturen und der jeweiligen mainstreams geprägt sind" (E. BRONFEN – B. MARIUS, "Hybride Kulturen", *Hybride Kulturen* [Hrsg. E. BRONFEN – B. MARIUS – Th. STEFFEN] [Tübingen 1997] 12).

Israel's Prophets Meet Athens' Philosophers: Scriptural Echoes in Acts 17,22-31

Acts 17,22-31 does not cite the Scriptures of Israel directly, but as many have observed, Paul's words parallel many scriptural texts. Generally, studies on Acts 17 address matters such as natural theology or the Greek philosophical background of the speech, but do not focus upon the role of the scriptural references as such, even when the presence of such intertextual connections is recognized. This study focuses on the specific role of the scriptural intertexts that are echoed in Paul's speech in order to contribute to a better understanding of the function of the Scriptures of Israel in both this passage and, implicitly, Luke-Acts generally. In contrast to how scriptural parallels in Paul's speech are generally treated by scholars, I will show that Luke uses intertextual echoes of the Scriptures of Israel in Acts 17,22-31 to present Paul's message as "prophetic speech". Paul's speech stands in continuity with those of Israel's prophets in the past. This continuity (recognized by scholars in other regards) serves an important purpose in Luke's narrative. Luke establishes continuity in order to validate that Paul's message is of God, and by extension, Luke's audience, and their faith that is based upon the preaching of the gospel, such as that done by Paul. I will first examine the speech itself, looking for intertextual echoes of Israel's Scriptures. Then I will discuss the larger function of these echoes beyond that of serving in Paul's apologetic. This study will contribute to a greater understanding of the function of the Scriptures of Israel in Paul's speech and Luke-Acts as a whole.

1. *Paul as Prophet in Acts*

As a preface to my argument, it is useful to observe that Luke characterized Paul as a prophet⁽¹⁾. Several pieces of data support this

⁽¹⁾ I am not considering Luke's characterization of others in Luke-Acts as prophets. For this, see D. MOESSNER "'The Christ Must Suffer': New Light on the Jesus – Peter, Stephen, Paul Parallels in Luke-Acts", *NT* 28 (1986) 225, who argues that "the characters of Jesus, Peter, Stephen and Paul are conceived of as prophets. Peter, Stephen and Paul are "Deuteronomistic rejected prophets" (227). See also D.P. MOESSNER, "Paul and the Pattern of the Prophet Like Moses in Acts", *SBL Seminar Papers, 1983* (SBLSP 22; Chico, CA 1983) 202-212, who

well-recognized assessment. Paul's encounter with Jesus on the road to Damascus bears the marks of a prophetic commissioning. Acts 9,15-16 describe Paul's future ministry as bearing witness to the Lord before the Gentiles⁽²⁾, much like the description of the mission of the Servant of the Lord in Isa 49,6. Likewise Acts 22,14-16 speaks of Paul hearing the voice of the Lord and bearing witness of the Lord before people. In Acts 26,16-18 Paul recounts the Lord appearing to him and telling Paul to be a witness and to open the eyes of the blind and bring light to darkness, reminiscent of Isa 6,9-10 and 9,1-2. In Acts 13,1, Luke narrates that prophets and teachers are assembled in Antioch. In Acts 13,2, the Holy Spirit calls for setting apart Saul and Barnabas to the work to which he has "called" them. This probably suggests that Saul and Barnabas are understood to be prophets by virtue of this "call". In Acts 13,46-47, Paul describes the mission that he and Barnabas are on, citing Isa 49,6 as justification for their approach. Paul himself thus characterizes his ministry in the words spoken by Isaiah of the Servant of the Lord. It would therefore be no surprise to Luke's audience to see Paul speaking as a prophet in Acts 17⁽³⁾.

2. *Intertextual Echoes of Scripture in Acts 17,22-31*

This much-discussed speech has been explored under many topics, such as the concept of natural theology. I am concerned with Luke's use of intertextual echoes from the Scriptures of Israel, which have received little scholarly attention beyond acknowledging parallels between the LXX and Paul's words⁽⁴⁾. Many authors, especially in commentaries,

argues that in the Lukan Journey narrative, Jesus is presented as a rejected Deuteronomistic prophet, and the parallels in Paul's journey to Rome show that Luke viewed Paul in the same way.

(²) N.A. BECK, "The Lukan Writer's Stories about the Call of Paul", *SBL Seminar Papers, 1983* (SBLSP 22; Chico, CA 1983) 214, states that the Lukan writer's presentation of Paul's conversion was probably also influenced by Dan 10,2-21.

(³) This characterization of Paul as a prophet is strengthened later in Acts. For example, in Acts 26,16-18 Paul describes his commission in terms reminiscent of Ezek 2,1-2 (Ezekiel's commission), Jer 1,9 (Jeremiah's commission) and Isa 42,6-7, 26-27 and 49,6 (commissioning of the Servant of the Lord), and in Acts 28,25-28 where Paul first cites Isa 6,9-10 and then alludes to Isa 40,5. See H.W.M. VAN DE SANDT, "Acts 28:28: No Salvation for the People of Israel? An Answer in the Perspective of the LXX", *ETL* 70 (1994) 349.

(⁴) See, for example, H. KÜLLING, *Geoffenbartes Geheimnis. Eine Auslegung von Apostelgeschichte 17, 16-34* (AThANT 79; Zurich 1993); C. CARAGOUNIS,

treat Paul's wording as "parallel" to many scriptural texts. They do not take this beyond an observation, and do not generally seek to treat in any systematic way what the force of these parallels signify. For example, multiple scholars see parallels between Paul's words in Acts 17,23 and Isa 45,14; Acts 17,24-25 and Gen 1-2, Isa 42,5, Ps 145,6, Gen 14,22, Exod 20,11, 1 Kgs 8,27, Ps 50,7-13, and Gen 2,7; Acts 17,26 and Gen 2,7-8, the genealogies of Genesis 5 and 10, Gen 11,9, Deut 32,8; Acts 17,27 and Gen 1,28-2,3, Deut 4,29, Ps 10,4 (MT), Isa 55,6, and Amos 5,6; Acts 17,29 and Deut 4,28-29, Psalm 113, Isa 40,19-19, Isa 44,9-20, and Isa 46,5-6; and Acts 17,31 and Pss 9,9, 95,13 and 97,9. It is not at all my intent to deny these parallels. Rather, I want to ask what these authors generally do not ask, What is the significance of the intertextual echoes in Paul's speech? I will consider these and other possible echoes below. While other scholars have recognized these parallels, they have done nothing with such observations. For example, Fitzmyer's observation on the scriptural language of Acts 17,25 consists of the banal statement that "Paul echoes a motif common to the OT" ⁽⁵⁾. While Külling has a greater focus on scriptural parallels, even his monograph related to the speech does little more with Luke's use of the Scriptures of Israel than observations such as that on Acts 17,24, when he states that the phrase πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ indicates that Luke has introduced a proposition of OT cosmology into the Areopagus speech ⁽⁶⁾. This study argues that these "parallels" serve a greater function within Paul's speech than making it sound "biblical".

I contend that, on the contrary, these are not merely parallels, but intentional intertextual echoes that are pervasive in Paul's speech and have a purpose far beyond simply making Paul's speech "parallel" in thought ⁽⁷⁾. To see these many echoes as merely "parallels" or texts to be compared, e.g., "cf. Gen 2,7", while useful, is a reductionistic understanding of what Luke is doing with the Scriptures of Israel in Paul's speech ⁽⁸⁾. Paul's speech echoes core scriptural traditions,

"Divine Revelation", *ERT* 12 (1988) 226-239; and B. GÄRTNER, *The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation* (Uppsala 1955).

⁽⁵⁾ J. FITZMYER, *The Acts of the Apostle*. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (New York 1998) 608.

⁽⁶⁾ KÜLLING, *Geoffenbartes*, 54.

⁽⁷⁾ I am using the term "intertextual echo" in much the same way as it is used by R.B. HAYS, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven, CT 1989).

⁽⁸⁾ For a similar argument based on other parts of Luke-Acts, see K.D. LITWAK, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts*. Telling the History of God's People Intertextually (Ph.D. diss., University of Bristol 2003).

primarily condemnation of idolatry, especially the condemnation of idolatry in Isaiah 40–48⁽⁹⁾. Luke uses these echoes to portray Paul's message as standing in continuity with the oracles of Israel's prophets, condemning idolatry at Athens in much the same way that the prophets condemned idolatry in Israel and Judah. Since Paul stands within this prophetic tradition, as a spokesperson for God, Paul's interpretation of the Scriptures and proclamation of God's plan is legitimated⁽¹⁰⁾.

Before examining the speech as such, it is necessary to argue for the view that this is an appropriate way of analyzing the text. Various views exist regarding what Paul was doing at the Areopagus⁽¹¹⁾ and what were the sources of his statements. Much of what Paul said has parallels in Greek philosophical texts, and those parallels are not to be denied. They are doubtless an important background element for Paul's speech. This is clear from the citation of Aratus in Acts 17,28. At the same time, Paul's statements about the coming judgment through Jesus Christ, and the resurrection, are clearly not derived from Greek thought. Given the strong emphasis in the Scriptures of Israel on the topics Paul covers, especially his anti-idol polemic, and the emphasis on future judgment and resurrection, it is best to see that Paul's "underlying thought remains thoroughly biblical". Paul's speech is rooted in scriptural thought throughout⁽¹²⁾. While granting

⁽⁹⁾ See also D.W. PAO, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (Tübingen 2000) 193.

⁽¹⁰⁾ See M. SOARDS, *The Speeches in Acts. Their Content, Context, and Concerns* (Louisville, KY 1994) 202 who states that the speeches in Acts "seem to bring the past into play in order to establish continuity...by simply alluding to segments of Scripture", including Paul's speech in Acts 17,16-31. Soards asserts that the "reference to the prophets [in speeches] functions to identify testimony to the validity of the speaker's point(s)", 202.

⁽¹¹⁾ B. WINTER, "On Introducing Gods to Athens: An Alternative Reading of Acts 17:19-20", *TB* 47 (1996) 80-85, argues, rightly I think, that Paul is brought before the council of the Areopagus because the Athenians understand him to be the herald of a new deity. The addition of a new deity to the Athenian pantheon must be officially approved by the council of the Areopagus. Generally a herald had to provide funds for the purchase of land for a temple and an altar for sacrifice, and show what benefit the god has provided the Athenians. Paul, according to Winter, argues that none of this is needed since God does not live in a temple, does not need sacrifices, and has helped the Athenians by bringing salvation and the hope of resurrection through Jesus.

⁽¹²⁾ J.B. POLHILL, *Acts* (Nashville, TN 1992) 370. See also A.-M. DUBARLE, "Le Discours à L'Aréopage (Actes 17, 22-31) et Son Arrière-Plan Biblique", *RSPT* 57 (1973) 578-581.

that Paul's speech is couched in such a way that its ideas would resonate, for the most part, with a pagan audience, I am considering only scriptural intertexts in Paul's speech. There are no specific quotations from the Scriptures of Israel, so this study will focus more on echoed scriptural traditions⁽¹³⁾. These intertextual echoes should not be discounted as unimportant because they are not scriptural quotations. Luke's recounting of the annunciation of John's birth in Luke 1 reverberates with scriptural intertexts, and those intertexts have a significance far beyond simply giving the narrative a biblical style or tone⁽¹⁴⁾.

a) Worshipping the Unknown god: Acts 17,23

Beginning with 17,23, Paul declares to the Athenians that they worship God ignorantly. Their worship practices are flawed because they do not understand God's true nature, which Paul will describe in part in the speech. Paul will present God as revealed to Israel through the Scriptures, the God the Athenians worship incorrectly because they do not know his true nature. Paul is being more delicate than Isaiah, but like Isaiah's anti-idol polemic, echoed later in the speech, Paul is saying that the Athenians' knowledge of the true God is defective, and therefore they worship him but do so incorrectly. This motif of the nations not knowing God is common in the Scriptures of Israel. For example, while the focus of the passage is on judgment on Judah's neighbors, Jeremiah refers to the nations that do not know God: "Pour out your wrath upon the nations that do not know you and the peoples who do not call upon your name" (Jer 10,25). The psalmist also speaks of those who are ignorant of God: "pour out your wrath upon the nations that do not know you" (Ps 78,6)⁽¹⁵⁾. In Isa 44,8-9, the prophet mocks those who, ignorant of the true God, worship nature instead. Isaiah continues this polemic in the next chapter, attacking those who, lacking knowledge, pray to gods that cannot save (Isa 45,20). Isa 45,14 says that the nations that currently do not know YHWH will come to

⁽¹³⁾ This means that it is not necessary to hunt for *the* specific text that Paul's speech alludes to in a given passage. Rather, it is likely valid to hear many intertextual echoes from the Scriptures of Israel throughout this speech. I am not contending, therefore, that in any specific statement in Paul's speech that Paul/Luke necessarily had a particular verse in mind.

⁽¹⁴⁾ See J.B. GREEN, "The Problem of a Beginning: Israel's Scriptures in Luke 1-2", *BBR* 4 (1994) 61-85; and LITWAK, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts*, 91-150.

⁽¹⁵⁾ See DUBARLE, "Le Discours", 580.

know that he is God and there is no other. These verses are not echoed by Paul as such but the ideas they express are clearly present, just as many of the statements throughout the Areopagus address reflect elements of the anti-idol polemic of Isaiah 40–48: the inability of idols to speak, see or help, the foolishness of bowing down to something that is made with human hands, especially when part of the original tree was used to cook the worshiper's dinner and the view that God is transcendent above all, and cannot therefore be represented by anything. Isaiah's assertions that idolaters and makers of idols do not know is interesting in light of Paul's words in Acts 17,23 concerning the "unknown god". Paul says that what the Athenians worship ignorantly he will proclaim to them. Paul seeks to correct their ignorance, just as Isaiah proclaims to his people the true God as opposed to the idols they worship without knowledge of the true God. Paul refers to the altar of the unknown god in Acts 17,23a, the ignorant worship of the Athenians in 17,23b, the groping after God in 17,27 and God's overlooking of the times of ignorance in Acts 17,30. Clearly, the failure of Paul's audience to recognize the true God is an important theme in Paul's speech, as well as in many scriptural intertexts which may lie behind the speech. Thus, Paul's discourse begins by echoing themes expressed by Israel's prophets, especially Isaiah⁽¹⁶⁾.

b) God as Creator: Acts 17,24

Paul continues to echo the Scriptures of Israel in Acts 17,24. There are two main parts to this verse. The first is the assertion that God made the world and all that is in it. This statement echoes an extensive scriptural tradition. All of Genesis 1 describes this process, while the specific assertion that God created the world may be found in Gen 1,1 and 2,1-4. Isaiah calls upon his audience to consider who God is, based upon his activity as creator of the stars (cf. Isa 40,25-26). Isa 40,28 ties together the idea of knowing who God is and his activity as creator. This verse joins two of the themes of Paul's speech. First, Paul tells the

⁽¹⁶⁾ It is reasonable to see echoes of Isaiah here as Isaiah's words are explicitly cited elsewhere in Luke-Acts, e.g., Luke 3,4-6; 4,17-19; 8,10; Acts 13,47. These clear quotations from Isaiah, especially Isaiah 40-49, justify seeing more subtle, intertextual echoes of Isaiah in Paul's speech at the Areopagus. Dubarle ("Le Discours", 581) argues that the order of the elements in Paul's speech follows the order in Isaiah 45, although it integrates other scriptural texts as well. I find his parallels suggestive and helpful for seeing the echoed traditions behind Paul's words, but am not convinced that Isaiah 45 actually provided the order for the statements in Acts 17,22-31.

Athenians they are ignorant of the one true God and then Paul goes on to describe this God as the creator of all. I am not arguing that Paul's two statements are based on this one verse as such, but this verse does show that Paul's words are echoing scriptural tradition. It is not essential that members of Luke's audience recognize Isa 40,28 specifically — only that they recognize in Paul's words pervasive biblical ideas. Isa 42,5a, speaks of God as the creator of heaven and earth. Similar assertions are made in Isa 45,12.18. Not only the prophetic literature, but also other texts testify to God as the creator, such as Gen 14,19, which speaks of God who created heaven and earth (cf. Gen 14,22). Exod 20,11 asserts that "in six days the Lord made heaven and earth and the seas and everything in them". Ps 145,6a likewise states that God made the heavens, the earth, the seas and everything in them.

Next, Paul asserts in 17,24b that, since God is lord of all, and has made all, he does not dwell in a building made by human hands. This idea, which is also asserted by Stephen in Acts 7,48-50⁽¹⁷⁾, echoes the assertion of several scriptural intertexts, such as 1 Kgs 8,27, which asks, "if heaven and the heaven of heavens are not sufficient for [God,]" how much less the house that Solomon built for God's name? Cf. 1 Chr 6,18. Isa 66,1-2a makes the same point, in which God asks, "heaven is my throne and the earth is my footstool for my feet. What house would you build for me?" Both of these texts indicate that, since God has made the heavens and the earth, he can obviously not be contained in a temple, contrary to the implication of the many temples in Athens⁽¹⁸⁾. The word χειροποιήτος occurs many times in the LXX. The Mosaic Law uses it when forbidding the manufacture of idols or to refer to idols themselves, "do not make for yourselves hand-made (χειροποίητα) idols" (Lev 26,1; cf. Lev 26,30). Isaiah predicts the disappearance of idols, καὶ τὰ χειροποίητα πάντα κατακρύψουσιν

⁽¹⁷⁾ The idea that no temple can hold God is clearly important to Luke, as it appears in separate speeches to Jews and to Gentiles. According to J. JESKA, *Die Geschichte Israels in der Sicht des Lukas*. Apg 7,2b-53 und 13,17-25 im Kontext antik-jüdischer Summarien der Geschichte Israels (Göttingen 2001) 211, this is part of Luke's critique of temples and thus of Gentile religiousness.

⁽¹⁸⁾ See DUBARLE, "Le Discours", 587; R. PESCH, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Apg 13-28) (EKK; Zürich 1986) II, 136; F.F. BRUCE, "Paul's Use of the Old Testament in Acts", *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament. Essays in Honor of E. Earle Ellis for His 60th Birthday*, (eds. G.F. HAWTHORNE – O. BETZ) (Grand Rapids, MI 1987) 75; FITZMYER, *Acts*, 608; and POLHILL, *Acts*, 373; and F.F. Bruce, *The Book of Acts* (Grand Rapids, MI 1988) 336.

(Isa 2,18; cf Isa 10,11; 31,7). Reflecting the same ideas as we have already seen in Isaiah 40–48⁽¹⁹⁾, Isaiah predicts that Moab's idols (τὰ χειροποίητα αὐτῆς) will not help her (Isa 16,12). Similar statements are made for Egypt (Isa 19,1) and Babylon (Isa 21,9). Isaiah mocks those who build and worship idols, i.e., things made with or by hand, ἐποίησαν χειροποίητα (Isa 46,6). Daniel also uses this term for idols (cf. Dan 5,4; 5,23; 6,28). In almost every use of this term in the Scriptures of Israel, the term χειροποίητος that literally means "something made with hands or by hand" is used metaphorically for idols. Since there are temples for the gods, but the true God does not, indeed cannot, dwell in a hand-made temple, and the true God cannot be represented by an idol (χειροποίητος), the Athenians worship God ignorantly. No one familiar with the Scriptures of Israel would miss echoes of these common scriptural themes and Luke's audience would surely have heard these scriptural echoes regarding items built with the hands, all of which are inappropriate or insufficient for God.

c) God is the Giver, not the Recipient: Acts 17,25

Paul continues to echo scriptural traditions in Acts 17,25. God has need of nothing but has in fact given to all creatures life and breath and all things. Paul's wording, διδούς πᾶσι ζωὴν καὶ πνοὴν καὶ τὰ πάντα, is similar to that of Isa 42,5, διδούς πνοὴν τῷ λαῷ τῷ ἐπ' αὐτῆς καὶ πνεῦμα τοῖς πατοῦσιν αὐτήν. Ps 50,7-13, which states that if God wanted something, he would take it himself and needs nothing from any human parallels conceptually Paul's statement that God is neither served by men nor needs anything from them. The creation account in Genesis states that God gave the breath of life to the first human (Gen 2,7), and that forms part of the echoed tradition in Paul's speech. Acts 17,24-25 thus echoes scriptural motifs throughout, even though they may be presented in a manner that is accessible to Paul's Gentile audience⁽²⁰⁾.

d) God is Sovereign over Humans: Acts 17,26

Continuing intertextual echoes of Scripture, Paul asserts in Acts 17,26 that God has made from one human all humans, and placed them on the earth. God has established time periods and boundaries for people. Paul's statement echoes the thought of Genesis 2,7-8, which

⁽¹⁹⁾ Most uses of χειροποίητος appear in Isaiah, and in each instance in Isaiah the word refers to idols. See PAO, *New Isaianic Exodus*, 195.

⁽²⁰⁾ See further J. JERVELL, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen 1998) 447.

says that God made a human and set him in the garden of Eden. From him, all people came, as shown by the genealogy in Genesis 5, which speaks of individuals, and Genesis 10, which speaks of the beginning of peoples, “these are the nations of the sons of Noah according to their generations” (Gen 10,32). Paul’s wording here likely emphasizes the “universality of humankind’s relationship to God”⁽²¹⁾, since Paul stresses that all nations came from one man who was made by God. The phrase “face of the earth” (προσώπου τῆς γῆς) is common in the Scriptures of Israel⁽²²⁾, though often in a negative sense (cf. Gen 4,14; 6,7). It is used in a neutral sense in Deuteronomy, where God’s election of Israel is described: “all the nations upon the face of the earth (ἐπὶ προσώπου τῆς γῆς)” (Deut 7,6). Paul’s statement that God made humans to dwell upon the face of the earth⁽²³⁾ is similar to Gen 11,9b: “and there the Lord God dispersed them upon the face of all the earth (ἐπὶ πρόσωπον πάσης τῆς γῆς)”. Paul next says in Acts 17,26b that God has fixed the times and boundaries of human existence, ὀρίσας προστεταγμένους καιροὺς καὶ τὰς ὁροθεσίας τῆς κατοικίας αὐτῶν. Their epochs and geographic boundaries are determined by God. In addition to Genesis 10, which describes the boundaries of nations, the thought of Acts 17,26 is expressed in Deut 32,8: “For the most high divided the nations as he separated the sons of Adam; he established regions for the nations (ὅρια ἔθνῶν)”. The wording of Acts 17,26, then, echoes scriptural traditions regarding God’s creation of humans from one man and God’s establishing of time periods and boundaries for nations. Since Luke regarded Moses as a prophet, echoing a theme from Deuteronomy is also an echo of a prophetic tradition. (Cf. Acts 3,21-24, which connects Moses to the prophet in 3,21, and refers to a “prophet” like Moses who would arise after Moses).

e) Seek God, and He will be Found: Acts 17,27

Acts 17,27 echoes the common scriptural motif of seeking God (ζητεῖν τὸν θεόν), because he is near to those who seek him⁽²⁴⁾, and

⁽²¹⁾ POLHILL, *Acts*, 374.

⁽²²⁾ Cf. Gen 2,6; Jer 32,12 (LXX). See F.F. BRUCE, *The Acts of the Apostles. The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI 1968) 337.

⁽²³⁾ The opposite is indicated in Zeph 1,3, καὶ ἐξαρθῶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς γῆς λέγει κύριος.

⁽²⁴⁾ JERVELL, *Apostelgeschichte*, 447 argues that 17,26 and 17,27 form one long statement. God made all people from one man, and set their time epochs and boundaries so that they might seek him.

will be found (εὑροῖεν). Israel is told many times to seek YHWH⁽²⁵⁾. The same vocabulary and concept is seen when Moses tells the people that if they seek God in their time of trouble because they have forsaken God, they will find him, ζητήσετε ἐκεῖ κύριον τὸν θεὸν ὑμῶν καὶ εὐρήσετε ὅταν ἐκζητήσητε αὐτὸν (Deut 4,29). It is important to note that this statement is made in a prophetic context, which forms part of the basis of the “Deuteronomistic history”⁽²⁶⁾. The books of 1 and 2 Chronicles refer to seeking God several times, e.g., “now give your hearts and souls to seek the Lord your God (τοῦ ζητῆσαι τῷ κυρίῳ θεῷ ὑμῶν) (1 Chr 22,19a). Using the same key verbs as Paul does, Solomon is told to seek God with all his heart and he will find him (ἐὼν ζητήσης αὐτὸν εὐρεθήσεται σοι) (1 Chr 28,9b)⁽²⁷⁾. Seeking God is also mentioned several times in Ezra⁽²⁸⁾. The psalmists also call for people to seek God⁽²⁹⁾. Ps 9,25 condemns sinners who do not seek God (οὐκ ἐκζητήσει οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ θεὸς ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ) (Ps 10,4 MT)⁽³⁰⁾. Ps 13,2 expresses an idea similar to Acts 17,27, saying that God looks for people who seek him (ἐκζητῶν τὸν θεόν).

The prophets of Israel also call upon people to seek God. Through Isaiah God calls people to seek him while he may be found: ζητήσατε τὸν θεὸν καὶ ἐν τῷ εὐρίσκειν αὐτὸν (Isa 55,6). In Isa 58,2, God rebukes those who seek (ζητοῦσιν) him with wrong motives. The implication of this verse is that seeking God and drawing near to him is a good thing, even though Israel is only doing so superficially. Hosea prophesies that Israel will return to God and seek him, οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἐπιζητήσουσιν κύριον τὸν θεόν (Hos 3,5). Amos calls on Israel to seek God, ἐκζητήσατε τὸν κύριον (Amos 5,6). Paul’s words echo the words of Israel’s prophets in directing the Athenians to seek God.

f) Idols are Nothing: Acts 17,29

Acts 17,29 resumes the echoes of the anti-idol polemic in the Scriptures of Israel. Deut 4,28-29 contrasts the future idolatry of Israel

⁽²⁵⁾ Cf. Isa 58,2; Jer 50,4; Ezek 20,40; 34,11; Dan 9,3; Hos 3,5; Amos 5,14.

⁽²⁶⁾ The main occurrences of the command to seek the Lord are found in the prophetic literature, Psalms and 2 Chronicles. See KÜLLING, *Geoffenbartes*, 104.

⁽²⁷⁾ Cf. 2 Chr 14,4; 15,12-13; 19,3; 26,5; 30,19; 34,3.

⁽²⁸⁾ Cf. Ezra 4,2; 6,21; 8,21-22.

⁽²⁹⁾ Cf. Pss 62,1; 68,7, 33; 69,5.

⁽³⁰⁾ It may be noted that the sense of the LXX and MT are different, the MT lacking the idea of provoking the Lord, but simply “the guilty in the greatness of his anger/face does not seek [God]”.

with the seeking of God that shall come afterwards. The wording of Psalm 113 parallels closely Paul's polemic. The logic of Acts 17,29 is based on a sequence of assertions. First, humans are God's offspring. Since humans are the works of God, nothing that humans can make can represent God. If this is so, then nothing that such lesser beings can make can equal the superior God who made them. Since humans are like God, and humans are not like any material thing, God is not like any material representation, be it stone, silver or gold, all of which are lesser than humans. Both the psalmist (εἰδωλα τῶν ἐθνῶν ἀργύριον καὶ χρυσίον) and Paul (χρυσῷ ἢ ἀργύρῳ ἢ λίθῳ, χαράγματι τέχνης) assert the inferiority of images made of gold and silver. Paul's statement especially echoes the anti-idol polemic of Isaiah. Isa 40,18-20 says that no likeness can be made of God: "to what will you liken the Lord and to what likeness will you liken him?" Like Paul, Isaiah notes that gold and silver are used for idols (μὴ εἰκόνα ἐποίησεν τέκτων ἢ χρυσοχόος χωνεύσας χρυσίον) (Isa 40,18-19), but should not be used for the true God⁽³¹⁾. (Cf. the similar vocabulary and polemic in Isa 46,5-6). Isa 44,9-20 also expresses the same scriptural tradition. Isa 44,19 particularly mocks the construction of idols, noting that one who builds idols cuts down trees, and uses them both for fire and for an idol. Such an idol is obviously not a real god nor worthy of homage as the one true God, who made us all, is due. Paul's message then at several points reflects and recalls the message of the prophet Isaiah in condemning the attempt to make an image to represent God.

g) God will Judge People in the Future: Acts 17,31

Paul's assertion that God is going to judge the world in Acts 17,31 also echoes a common scriptural tradition. Paul asserts that God has set a day when he will judge the world in righteousness. This echoes the words of the psalmists:

Ps 9,9	Ps 95,13b	Ps 97,9	Acts 17,31
καὶ αὐτὸς κρινεῖ	ὅτι ἐρχεται κρίναι	ὅτι ἡκεῖ κρίναι τὴν	ἔστησεν ἡμέραν ἐν ᾗ
τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐν	τὴν γῆν κρινεῖ	γῆν κρινεῖ	μέλλει κρίνειν
δικαιοσύνη	τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐν	τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐν	τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐν
	δικαιοσύνῃ	δικαιοσύνη	δικαιοσύνη

⁽³¹⁾ PAO, *Isaianic New Exodus*, 196 asserts that "in Acts 17:29 one...finds the climax of this piece of anti-idol polemic that should be understood within the wider framework of the anti-idol polemic in Isaiah".

These psalms all state that God will judge the world in righteousness. Paul's words stand firmly within this biblical tradition.

In each of the verses examined above, scriptural intertexts or traditions are echoed. These range from the creation account in Genesis to the anti-idol polemic of Isaiah. The pervasiveness of the scriptural traditions, which reverberate throughout Paul's speech, are too ubiquitous to be merely stylistic or simply "parallel" to the Scriptures of Israel. If these echoes are intentional, what are they used for, besides being part of Paul's argument? Before attempting to answer this question, let me stress the significance of the question. I am arguing that the Scriptures of Israel was not simply a source for intertextual echoes in Paul's speech or used merely to give it a biblical flavor. There is much more going on in Luke's narrative strategy that goes well beyond simply using Genesis or Isaiah or the Psalms for sources. What is this larger strategy?

3. The Function of the Scriptures of Israel in Paul's Areopagus Speech

The answer lies, I believe, in viewing these intertextual echoes through the narrative concept of "framing in discourse". The concept of framing in discourse, discussed by Deborah Tannen⁽³²⁾, is the notion that the way a narrative is introduced and presented provides clues as to how to understand the narrative or creates expectations on the part of the audience regarding the ensuing narrative. For example, the familiar words, "it was a dark and stormy night", prepare the audience for a detective murder mystery or the like. The phrase "once upon a time", when read by a "competent reader", i.e., someone with the necessary background assumed by the author, would lead the reader to expect a fairy tale. These two introductory phrases have a very different effect, and create very different expectations for an audience than, say, a news report that begins with the words, "Here are our top stories". The first example leads an audience to expect a specific genre of fiction. The last phrase leads an audience to expect the reporting of actual events that have just happened. Since framing in discourse is a basic part of how narration, including dialogue, is structured, it is only natural to look for framing in discourse in Paul's Areopagus speech.

So how does Luke frame his discourse about Paul's experience at Athens? In Acts 17,16, we read that as Paul walked around Athens, he

⁽³²⁾ "What Is a Frame? Surface Evidence for Underlying Expectations", *Framing in Discourse* (ed. D. TANNEN) (Oxford 1993) 15-56.

was provoked by all the idols. One can find similar statements in the Scriptures of Israel. 1 Kgs 16,13 records that God was provoked by the idols of the people. (Cf. 1 Kgs 16,26; 2 Kgs 17,16-17; Jer 8,19). This is not to suggest that Paul is standing in the place of God, but that to speak of one being provoked by idols is a well-known concept in the Scriptures of Israel. This means that the narrative context of Paul's speech begins with something common in the Scriptures of Israel: being provoked by idols. Then Paul begins his speech and immediately starts with echoes of scriptural traditions. Since the narrative context of Paul's speech begins with scriptural echoes, and his speech is pervaded by them, from a narrative perspective Luke's discourse about Paul's speech in Athens exemplifies framing in discourse via echoes of scriptural intertexts. When Luke's audience first encounters Acts 17,16, some of them at least will recall the background in the Scriptures of Israel concerning God, or the prophets or kings being provoked or grieved over the idols of the Israelites. This would lead Luke's audience to expect a narrative about condemnation of idolatry. When Paul is presented as saying the same kinds of things that Israel's prophets from the past said about idols, Luke's audiences will naturally interpret Paul's speech, based on this "prophetic" discursive framing as anti-idol polemic in the mold of the prophets of old⁽³³⁾. Luke has purposely composed his narrative to frame his discourse with scriptural echoes, especially those that point to the contrast between pagan worship and conceptions of God, and proper worship and correct understanding of the one true God. Since Luke provides this framing in discourse through the Scriptures of Israel, his audience will be led to expect a similar prophetic condemnation of pagan worship and beliefs about the (false) gods. At every turn, Paul echoes the traditional, scriptural concepts that are used by Israelite prophets in their condemnation of idolatry. Therefore, on a narrative level, Luke's audience will be led to interpret Paul's speech as the same type of anti-idol prophetic critique. This discursive framing guides Luke's audience in how to read the story of Paul at Athens and in how to

⁽³³⁾ This is not meant to suggest that there are specific categories of framing in discourse, including a prophetic one. Framing in discourse does not come in categories but is a narrative strategy to help an audience understand a narrative. Therefore, when I refer to Luke's discursive framing in this speech as "prophetic", I am only observing that in this particular account, and in this particular speech, Luke uses intertextual echoes of prophetic anti-idol polemic to frame his discourse. This is not like form criticism, where there are allegedly a small number of categories into which every gospel pericope must fit.

understand Paul's speech generically. Having established that Luke uses the Scriptures of Israel, through framing in discourse, to lead his audience to expect Paul's speech to be an instance of prophetic anti-idol polemic, the next question is, Why would Luke do this?

a) Scriptural Echoes and Continuity through Framing in Discourse

Luke takes this approach in order to show continuity between Paul's message and the message of the prophets. The oracles of the prophets against idolatry teach that idols are false gods. Paul argues that idols are not the true God, but that the Athenians are ignorant of the true God. The prophets assert that God created everything, and therefore cannot dwell in a temple. Paul argues that God created everything and cannot therefore dwell in a temple. The prophets predict a coming judgment by God against those who seek idols. Paul promises a day when God will judge those who seek idols. These points of similarity, and the characterization of Paul's speech as the anti-idol polemic of Israelite prophets, means that Paul's speech stands in the same stream of scriptural tradition as the prophetic critiques made by Isaiah, Jeremiah and other prophets concerning idols. These connections between Paul's speech and that of Israel's prophets of old show a continuity in message and emphases between Israel's prophetic oracles and Paul's speech.

Also arguing that Luke was concerned with continuity between Israel in the past and Christians in his day, G.W. Trompf has shown that Luke, like Polybius and other Hellenistic historiographers, built "recurrence" and "reenactment" into his narrative. Luke crafted his narrative to present events in Luke-Acts as reenactments of events in the Scriptures of Israel. According to Trompf, Luke was not simply interested in fleeting allusions to past parallels, or making orderly *pesharim* on long sequences in the Scriptures, or using "prophecy fulfillment" to authenticate Jesus. Rather, "Luke was fundamentally interested in...directly historical connections as an historian of the Hellenistic period". Luke wrote as though historical events, which he saw as divinely guided, had their own interconnections "between events amounting to the virtual reenactment of special happenings or the repetition of an earlier stage of history in a later one" ⁽³⁴⁾. Trompf demonstrates that this same notion of recurrence may be found in historians in the Scriptures of Israel. The Deuteronomist, for example,

⁽³⁴⁾ G.W. TROMPF, *The Idea of Historical Recurrence in Western Thought. From Antiquity to the Reformation* (Berkeley 1979) 129.

presents Moses as a prophet in Deuteronomy, and shows prophets after Moses, particularly Elijah, acting similarly. The Chronicler shows recurrence in numerous ways, including the pattern of the transfer of leadership, first from Moses to Joshua, and later to Solomon from David. Trompf asserts that when Luke, following earlier historians, showed these recurrences in his narrative, he was "writing historically by his lights". Luke used this approach of showing events in his narrative as reenactments to show their significance, which "was integral to his historiographical enterprise, not just a passing theological reflection over and above his narrative"⁽³⁵⁾. Ancient historians, says Trompf, worked out such connections with great seriousness, as these connections brought cohesion and significance to their narratives. Luke, quite familiar with this practice in the Old Testament, used it himself to show continuity between Christians and Israelites. Of relevance to this study is Trompf's emphasis on Jesus (and his followers) as prophets, standing "in line with the ancient prophets" through reenactment⁽³⁶⁾. Trompf does not deal with Paul's speech at the Areopagus, but it is appropriate, based on the connections with Israel's prophets that I have already identified in Acts 17, to see Paul's anti-idol polemic on Mars Hill as a reenactment that connects Paul's preaching with that of Israel's prophets in the past. Trompf's work is important for showing that Luke did not create such connections simply for stylistic reasons. They have significance for Luke's narrative and we should take them seriously as evidence that Luke's narrative intends to establish continuity between Israel's past and "the things accomplished among us".

b) The Function of Continuity in Luke's Narrative of Paul's Speech

This conclusion that Paul's speech stands in continuity with prophetic oracles in the past is important for understanding how Luke has deployed the Scriptures of Israel in this speech. If we read Luke's narrative as historiography, then the role of the pervasive intertextuality I have identified becomes transparent. This is because one common goal of Hellenistic historiographers was to show continuity between people and events in the past and people and events in the present. The reason is that the historiographer validated the people and events of the present by their continuity with people and events in the past. For these writers, the past is used for reaffirmation

⁽³⁵⁾ TROMPF, *Historical Recurrences*, 135-136.

⁽³⁶⁾ TROMPF, *Historical Recurrences*, 142.

and validation. David Lowenthal states that “the past validates present attitudes and actions by affirming their resemblances to former ones. Previous usage seals with approval what is now done. Historical precedent legitimates what exists today”⁽³⁷⁾. By looking back to the revered past, and showing how the present is like it, historians validate present events. So, by showing that Paul’s speech shares continuity with the sacred oracles of Israel’s prophets in the past, and reflects the provocation of God and God’s servants towards idols in Israel’s revered past, Luke uses the Scriptures of Israel, through framing in discourse, to validate or legitimate Paul’s message.

This validation is important because it implies that Paul’s interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel, both here and elsewhere, is correct, over against other groups that claim to have the correct interpretation. This enables Luke to use the Scriptures to legitimate the faith of his audience, as they have believed the message concerning Jesus, which Paul preached. Since Paul’s message is legitimated, those who believe this message are legitimated.

c) Implications for Luke’s Use of Scripture Elsewhere

This conclusion has important ramifications for the study of Luke’s use of the Scriptures of Israel. First, this text shows that it is necessary to have a larger database than some of the quotations and obvious allusions to the Scriptures in Luke-Acts to determine how Luke used the Scriptures of Israel. It is obviously appropriate to consider quotations, but my study demonstrates the need to go beyond only some quotations, such as those of purported Christological significance⁽³⁸⁾. Should not Luke’s use of Scripture in Paul’s address at Mars Hill be considered in determining how the Scriptures function in Luke’s narrative? Granted, intertextual echoes do not supersede or trump quotations, but can we say that we have truly studied Luke’s use of the Scriptures of Israel if we leave out data that has importance for this question? This speech, and by implication, other places in Luke-Acts where Luke has used the Scriptures of Israel through both quotations and intertextual echoes, that are not generally considered in assessing Luke’s use of Scripture, ought to be included in such a study.

Second, Luke’s use of the Scriptures in Paul’s speech shows that we should not accept without questioning the conclusion that Luke

⁽³⁷⁾D. LOWENTHAL, *The Past Is a Foreign Country* (Cambridge 1985) 40.

⁽³⁸⁾ See chapter one of LITWAK, “Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts” for a summary of the approaches to Luke’s deployment of the Scriptures of Israel.

uses the Scriptures for Christology or promise-fulfillment. He may do this in some places, but when it is clear that he has used them otherwise, we should give attention to this evidence in forming a view about Luke's approach. I have argued elsewhere that at key points in Luke's narrative, he uses the Scriptures of Israel not for Christology but principally for ecclesiology, to speak to the identity of the true people of God⁽³⁹⁾. The results of examining Paul's Areopagus speech strengthen this thesis because here too, Luke uses the Scriptures of Israel, through framing in discourse, to validate Paul's message and implicitly, the faith of those who believe Paul's message. Since they are validated in this way, they must be the true people of God. Given that Luke's use of the Scriptures of Israel in Paul's Areopagus speech serves to legitimate the beliefs of the followers of the Way, his deployment of the Scriptures in Acts 17,16-34 relates to the people of God, or ecclesiology, not for Christology or to show promise-fulfillment. This fact should be considered in future studies that assess the function of the Scriptures of Israel in Luke-Acts. Paul's Areopagus speech is only one speech in Luke's narrative, but the results of this study show that many other texts should be considered afresh for the way the Scriptures are deployed in them by Luke and what overall function scriptural quotations, allusions or echoes serve in those texts.

A brief word should be said about the function of Paul's speech on Mars Hill. Irrespective of one's judgment regarding the relationship between Luke's narrative and an actual speech-event at Mars Hill, it remains the case that Luke has framed his discourse that includes the speech with scriptural echoes. I do not think that Paul's original speech, whatever may be said of it, sought to legitimate his message as standing in continuity with the message of the prophets of Israel. To achieve such a result, Paul's audience would have had to be much more conversant in the Scriptures of Israel than is likely. In its original setting the speech most likely was an instance of Paul's fulfilling his commission to preach the good news about Jesus to the Gentiles. Being a Jew, steeped in the Scriptures of Israel, his speech was built upon scriptural themes but presented in a way that would be meaningful to his elite Gentile audience. The speech, as Paul spoke it, was therefore a culturally-sensitive presentation of the gospel. Luke is responsible for the speech's present shape and function within his narrative, and thus responsible for the way the Scriptures of Israel are

(39) LITWAK, "Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts".

deployed in the speech. Therefore, it is appropriate to consider how Luke has used the Scriptures of Israel in this speech in an effort to understand how Luke has used them throughout Luke-Acts.

*
* *

This study has demonstrated that, far from Paul's Areopagus speech merely having parallels with the Scriptures of Israel, Luke's summary of Paul's message is replete with echoes of well-known scriptural traditions, especially those reflected by Israel's prophets. These intertextual echoes are used by Luke as part of a narrative technique known as framing in discourse, which provides clues to an audience as to how to understand the ensuing narrative or creates for the audience expectations about what sort of narrative they are about to encounter. This discursive framing points to continuity between Paul's message, and prophetic oracles from Israel's Scriptures that emphasize anti-idol polemic. This continuity within a historiographical work serves to validate the message of Paul as from God and implicitly validates the faith of Luke's audience who believe the message of the gospel. Luke's use of the Scriptures of Israel in Paul's speech, since they function to validate the faith of Luke's audience as God's people, is ecclesiological.

Asbury Seminary
204 North Lexington Avenue
Wilmore, KY 40390
USA

Kenneth D. LITWAK

SUMMARY

Generally, treatments of Paul's speech note biblical parallels to Paul's wording but find no further significance to these biblical allusions. This study argues that Luke intends far more through this use of the Scriptures of Israel beyond merely providing sources for Paul's language. I contend that, through the narrative technique of "framing in discourse", Luke uses the Scriptures of Israel to lead his audience to interpret Paul's speech as standing in continuity with anti-idol polemic of Israel's prophets in the past. As such, read as historiography, Luke's narrative uses this continuity to legitimate Paul's message and by implication, the faith of Luke's audience. Luke's use of the Scriptures here is ecclesiological.

Crying to God Prayer and Plot in the Book of Judith

In his formcritical study of biblical prayer, P. D. Miller remarks: "Almost any address to God functions as prayer. ... virtually every such address is perceived as receiving either an explicit or implicit response from God" ⁽¹⁾. This statement is a challenge for the narrative analysis of biblical texts. At least it implies that prayers and praying have a function as regards the plot of a story. In this article, I intend to examine the narrative function of prayers, not only as regards the plot but also concerning the characterisation of biblical characters, God included ⁽²⁾, and their possible contribution to the overall thematic and theological line in one concrete story: the book of Judith. In order to do so, I will analyse the many prayers in the book of Judith ⁽³⁾.

1. *Prayer and praying in the book of Judith*

In a broad sense, prayer/praying can be defined as the human addressing of their God or even "conversation with God" ⁽⁴⁾. This general definition can be more restricted as regards the content, intent and/or form. Prayer may then be described as a speech through which a person or the people bring his/her/their situation before God ⁽⁵⁾. It addresses God in the second person ⁽⁶⁾. Moreover, it is also securing response from God ⁽⁷⁾, which distinguishes a prayer from casual

⁽¹⁾ P.D. MILLER, *They Cried to the Lord*. The Form and Theology of Biblical Prayer (Minneapolis 1994) 33.

⁽²⁾ S.E. BALENTINE, *Prayer in the Hebrew Bible*. The Drama of Divine-Human Dialogue (Overtures to Biblical Theology; Minneapolis 1993).

⁽³⁾ This analysis is part of a research project I conduct as Postdoctoral Fellow of the Fund of Scientific Research Flanders at the Catholic University of Leuven (Belgium).

⁽⁴⁾ E.S. GERSTENBERGER, "פִּלֵּי", TWAT VI, 606-617, 613; MILLER, *They Cried*, 33.

⁽⁵⁾ H. REVENTLOW, *Gebet im Alten Testament* (Stuttgart – Berlin – Köln – Mainz 1986) 89.

⁽⁶⁾ J. CORVIN, *A Stylistic and Functional Study of the Prose Prayers in the Historical Narratives of the Old Testament* (Ph.D. Diss.; Emory University 1972) 156, quoted in BALENTINE, *Prayer*, 30.

⁽⁷⁾ E. STAUDT, *Prayer and the People in the Deuteronomist* (Ph.D. Diss.; Vanderbilt University 1980) 58, quoted in BALENTINE, *Prayer*, 20-21.

speech⁽⁸⁾. I will take praying and prayer as the explicit address of God, initiated by an individual or group, with the expectation that this address is (well) received by God. Not all human-divine conversation is prayer, since prayer suggests that it be initiated by the human party. Moreover, phrases that have their main function in human-human communication (e.g. the greetings in Ru 2,4) are excluded as well.

For our investigation of plot, characterisation and theme, the mere fact *that* people pray is important. If the prayer is quoted in direct speech, or abbreviated in indirect speech, the readers can deduce clearly what is expected from God. Yet, a sentence as “they cried out to God” may have an effect on the plot as well since this prayer may evoke a reaction of God. Moreover, the fact that someone prays, is part of his/her characterisation and may build up a narrative-theological theme. Therefore, I offer in the diagram below a survey of references to all prayers in the book of Judith, indicating also the prayer language and/or the introductory formula’s.

References to people praying without mentioning specific content	Prayers quoted in direct speech (God addressed in second person, with introductory formula)	Prayers with the content quoted in indirect speech (with introductory formula)
4,9: ἀνεβόησαν πᾶς ἄνθρωπος Ἰσραὴλ πρὸς τὸν θεόν 5,12: ἀνεβόησαν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν αὐτῶν 7,19: οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ ἀνεβόησαν πρὸς κύριον θεὸν αὐτῶν 7,29: ἐβόησαν πρὸς κύριον τὸν θεόν 10,1: βοῶσα πρὸς τὸν θεὸν Ἰσραὴλ 11,17: προσεύχομαι πρὸς τὸν θεόν 12,6: ἐπὶ προσευχὴν ἐξεληθεῖν 13,3: ἐπὶ τὴν προσευχὴν αὐτῆς 13,10: ἐπὶ τὴν προσευχὴν 16,18: προσεκύνησαν τῷ θεῷ	6,18-19: πεσόντες ὁ λαὸς προσεκύνησαν τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐβόησαν λέγοντες 9,1-14: ἐβόησεν ... Ἰουδιθ πρὸς κύριον καὶ εἶπεν 13,4-5: εἶπεν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς (κύριε ...) 13,7: εἶπεν ... (κύριε ...) 13,17: κύψαντες προσεκύνησαν τῷ θεῷ καὶ εἶπαν εὐλογητὸς εἶ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν ... 16,1-17: εἶπεν Ἰουδιθ	4,12: ἐβόησαν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν Ἰσραὴλ 4,15: ἐβόων πρὸς κύριον 6,21: ἐπεκαλέσαντο τὸν θεὸν Ἰσραὴλ 8,31: δεήθητι 12,8: ἐδέετο τοῦ κυρίου θεοῦ Ἰσραὴλ

The prayers without specific content mentioned, as well as those mentioning the content in indirect speech, make use of specific prayer language, which as such indicates a direct human address of God ([ἄννα] βοῶσα πρὸς [τὸν θεόν]; προσεύχομαι, προσευχή, ἐπικαλέω [τὸν θεόν], δέομαι). Some of the explicitly recited prayers contain prayer

⁽⁸⁾ BALENTINE, *Prayer*, 30-31.

language in the introductory formula as well, but when a prayer is quoted, a simple introductory use of the verb λέγω may suffice since the formal address of God in the second person already indicates that this is a prayer indeed. Whether the prayers in Jdt 16 can formally be identified as prayers is debatable. The comparison between Jdt 16,18 (προσεκύνησαν τῷ θεῷ) and Jdt 6,18-19; 13,17 suggests that this action implies prayer. Jdt 16 mainly is Judith's song of thanksgiving. Judith seems to direct it to the people, not to God, and summons her people to praise God, which places the song in a human-human context rather than in an explicit human-divine communication (Jdt 16,1-2). Yet, since the people indeed sing a song of praise, and the second part of the song is directed to God in the second person, addressing God directly (Jdt 16,13-16), one may also argue that this is a prayer.

All people praying in the book of Judith belong to the people of Israel, and their prayers are all directed to (their) God (Jdt 4,9; 5,12; 11,17; 16,18; 13,17), who is several times addressed as 'God, the Lord' (Jdt 4,15; 7,19; 7,29) or the '(Lord) God of Israel' (Jdt 4,12; 6,21; 10,1; 12,8; 13,7).

2. *Prayer and plot in Judith*

As by definition "plot" indicates the sequence of events in a narrative text⁽⁹⁾, the mere fact that Israel cries to God is part of the plot. Yet, as far as we are concerned, our interest is not only to note this fact, but also to analyse in how far a prayer, which implies the idea that God receives the prayer, effects the ensuing events.

a) The prayers of the people and their leaders in Jdt 4-8

Nebuchadnezzar wants to punish all the people of the whole earth for not having fought with him in a previous war. Out of fear for Jerusalem and the temple (Jdt 4,1-3), the people living in Judea decide to resist and prepare for war. Moreover, they pray all over the country (Jdt 4,9), as well as in Jerusalem (Jdt 4,12). The content of the prayer in Jdt 4,12 ("not to give up their infants as prey and their wives as booty, and the cities they had inherited to be destroyed, and the sanctuary to be profaned and desecrated to the malicious joy of the Gentiles" RSV) betrays their expectation that this God will listen to

⁽⁹⁾ Compare J.L. SKA, *"Our Fathers have Told Us"*. Introduction to the Analysis of Hebrew Narratives (Subsidia Biblica 13; Rome 2000) 19.

them, and, since this is a petition, is willing to interfere and grant their request.

The actual effect of these prayers on the plot is clear: God hears their prayer (Jdt 4,13). Actually, this is the only direct action of God mentioned in the whole book. The formulation of this verse reminds one of Exod 2,24-25, and Exod 3,7. In the exodus story, God's hearing and seeing involves delivering his people and sending Moses to make that happen. The intertextuality⁽¹⁰⁾ suggests that God again will deliver his people by sending someone to lead them. The readers will consequently interpret the deliverance of the people through Judith's actions in a similar way as God's delivering of the people by sending Moses. That the characters of the story do not know of God's reaction⁽¹¹⁾, has an effect on the plot as well. The people keep on fasting and offering, the priests keep on praying (Jdt 4,15). Since they do not realise they are being heard, the people of Bethulia eventually even come to the conclusion that this situation of military crisis must be God's punishment for their sins and those of their fathers (Jdt 7,28)⁽¹²⁾ and they want to surrender.

The conclusion of the people contrasts with that of their opponent Achior in Jdt 5. Achior advises against attacking Bethulia if the people did not sin against their God, since this God will avenge them. In order to make his point, he recalls the events in Egypt. The prayers of the people had a clear effect upon the events: God struck Egypt with plagues (Jdt 5,12). It is part of the irony in the book, that the enemy Achior displays more confidence in the possible effect of the prayers of Israel than the Israelites do. For despite the repeated prayers of the inhabitants of Bethulia (Jdt 6,19; 7,19.29) and those of their leaders

⁽¹⁰⁾ Other references to the Exodus and wilderness stories, are: the image of horses and riders as symbol of power, the "Lord who crushes war" (Jdt 7,9; 16,2; Exod 15,3[LXX]), the plagues in Egypt (Jdt 5,11-12), the acknowledgement of YHWH as the ultimate goal of the deliverance of Israel (see Jdt 9,14; Exod 6,7; 7,5; 8,18; 9,14; etc.), and the stories about Massa and Meriba (Exod 17; Numb 20; Jdt 7,23ff). For this last aspect, see J.H. VAN HENTEN, "Judith as Alternative Leader. A Rereading of Judith 7-13", *A Feminist Companion to Esther, Judith and Susanna* (ed. A. BRENNER) (The Feminist Companion to the Bible 7; Sheffield 1995) 224-252.

⁽¹¹⁾ Even Judith, who trusts till the end that God will save his people, seems to be unaware that God already heard their prayer. See 8,17: "he will hear us if it pleases him".

⁽¹²⁾ As remarked by T. CRAVEN, "'From Where Will My Help Come?' Women and Prayer in the Apocrypha/Deuterocanonical Books", *Worship and the Hebrew Bible* (ed. M.P. GRAHAM) (JSOTSS 284; Sheffield 1999) 95-109, 105.

(Jdt 6,21), the people demand that Uzziah surrenders the town (Jdt 7,27-28). Uzziah still hopes that God will intervene, but sets a deadline of five days. Nevertheless, he believes that the prayer for rain of a devout woman as Judith may be the pivotal point in the events: "then they will no longer be faint" (Jdt 8,31), a conclusion that takes for granted that God will hear such a prayer.

b) The prayer of Judith (Jdt 9; 10,1)

Judith declares to her leaders that God will deliver Israel through her hand. The whole prayer of Jdt 9 is a plea for divine support for her plans. Moreover, the prayer already hints at her concrete plans, which she refused to reveal to her leaders (Jdt 8,32-34). Both aspects are, as I will show, of great importance as far as the plot is concerned. The prayer can be divided into two parts. Jdt 9,2-4, refers at the past (cf. Gen 34), the second part, Jdt 9,5-14, at the current events. For our purpose, the first part is especially relevant, since all the references to the past events are presented as the result of God's answering the prayer of Judith's ancestor Simeon. Judith clearly hopes that her prayer will have a similar effect (cf. Jdt 9,4).

The answered prayer of Simeon (Jdt 9,2-4). According to Judith's account, Simeon and his followers called upon God for help, because of their zeal for God and their abhorrence of what happened to Dinah. This prayer was answered, since God gave Simeon a sword in his hand to strike those villains who defiled Dinah. In contrast to Gen 34, God is the main actor in Jdt 9,2-4. Since God is its initiator, the violence is also legitimate: God gives the sword to Simeon, gives the enemy up to die, gives the people a large booty (contrary to Jacob's condemnation of the violence in Gen 34,30; 49,5-7). In contrast to Gen 34,2, the rape scene is recounted abundantly. The attackers first loosen the girdle, uncover the thighs, and pollute the womb. To the victim this means defilement, shame and disgrace, and this defilement is presented as if it were a mass rape.

Simeon's point of view on the events is used in order to create a link between Simeon and Judith, both as regards the characterisation and concerning the plot. Judith wants to become God's instrument to deliver his people. This is her own initiative, no divine mission is mentioned, nor an assignment given by her leaders. By praying, Judith asks for God's agreement and support for her purpose and plans. If she succeeds, her prayer is heard. In this way, the whole prayer of Jdt 9 thus functions as implicit religious legitimization of Judith's ensuing

actions. God is portrayed as the main motor of the events, which are likely to proceed in the same successful way as Simeon's venture.

Moreover, the links between Judith and Simeon offer the readers concrete keys of understanding the ensuing events⁽¹³⁾. Just like Simeon, who used deceit as well as the sword against his enemy, also Judith will kill the enemy with his own sword after having used her "deceitful lips" (Jdt 9,10). As Simeon took booty, Judith and her people will take abundant booty too. And on top of that: just like Simeon acted with God's approval and on his assignment, also Judith looks for God's support and approval. For it is God who has to defeat the enemy, and Judith is "but" his instrument. In the same way that God gave Simeon a sword, God should give Judith's hand the power to defeat the enemy (Jdt 9,9; 13,7).

To conclude, the reference to the answered prayer of Simeon has, as far as the plot is concerned, a double function. On the one hand, it raises the readers' expectation that Judith's prayer will be answered too, meanwhile guiding their interpretation by suggesting that in the ensuing events, God is at work through Judith. On the other hand, this part of the prayer offers the readers concrete keys as regards Judith's plans of action.

Jdt 9,5-14. In the last part of her prayer, Judith prays again to be heard. The clues as regards the plot already present in Jdt 9,2-4 are repeated and worked out. God should give Judith the strength to carry out what she plans. Deceitful lips should strike down the slave with the prince (Jdt 9,3.10). The latter expression is in Wisd 18,11 a reference to the deaths of the firstborn of Egypt, which will ultimately lead to the deliverance of Israel. This allusion gives the readers a hint to what end Judith wants to "defeat slaves as well as princes", namely in order to deliver her people. Moreover, Judith will do so by using deceit (Jdt 9,10.13, possibly somehow linked with a bed, see Jdt 9,3) and the sword. This last aspect may also be evoked by Jdt 9,4 if the request "hear me, a widow" is read as an allusion to Exod 22,22-24. God will hear the widow and kill with the sword those who afflicted her when she cries out to him.

The arrogance of the enemy should be crushed 'by the hand of a woman'. This phrase is taken out of the story of Jael (Judg 4-5). Since

⁽¹³⁾ A situation of mixed reading positions is created. Judith does not say straightforwardly what exactly she will do (character-elevating reading position). Still, the readers know more than Judith's leaders or Holofernes and his men (reader-elevating reading position).

Jael killed Sisera in her tent, by driving a tent pin through his head, this phrase evokes the possibility that Judith will try to kill the general of the enemy (and actually, in a similar location and by a comparable wound, making use of the opportunity that the drinking of the enemy creates)⁽¹⁴⁾.

Judith also mentions the ultimate purpose of God's action: the acknowledgement of all the people that God is the God of power and might. This is the opposite aim of the rationale which drove Nebuchadnezzar's men: all their actions were meant to lead to the universal worshipping of Nebuchadnezzar as god (Jdt 3,8), excluding the possibility that any other deity has power (see Jdt 6,2: "who is god except Nebuchadnezzar?"). This line of the plot is now countered by the possibility that the opposite event will take place: the whole people will acknowledge the God of Israel. Even Achior, the Ammonite, will eventually have faith in this God (Jdt 14,10).

The prayer of Judith is clearly of importance as far as the plot is concerned. Through biblical allusions, including a reference to an answered prayer of the past, it is suggested that God will answer her prayer and act through Judith. Moreover, concrete hints as regards the concrete development of the events are given.

c) Judith's prayers in the hostile camp (Jdt 11–13)

Two lines of plot are present in Jdt 11–13: the deceitful plot of Judith, suggesting that her actions, her prayers included, will lead to the victory of Holofernes on the one hand; and on the other hand, Judith's true plans to defeat her enemy and to deliver her people. Prayer has a function in both the deceitful and the 'real' plot.

Judith tells Holofernes that she will go out every night to pray (Jdt 11,17; 12,6–8). This fits her deceit. She tells the (at least in the ears of the enemy) plausible lie that when she prays to God, her God will inform her when the Israelites have sinned (Jdt 11,17), which will be the first step in the victory of Holofernes. Yet, the so-called prayers to find out whether Israel has already sinned, also fulfil a function in the 'real' plot. The enemy gets accustomed to the idea that Judith and her slave woman leave the camp regularly. In this way, Judith will be able to escape once she has killed Holofernes (Jdt 13,3.10).

Judith's actual prayers all deal with the 'real' plot, since she prays

⁽¹⁴⁾ See S.A. WHITE, "In the Steps of Jael and Deborah: Judith as Heroine", *No One Spoke Ill of Her. Essays on Judith* (ed. J.C. VAN DER KAM) (SBL EJS 2; Atlanta 1992) 5–16.

God to guide her way (Jdt 12,8), to act through her and to give her strength (Jdt 13,4-5.7). That Judith indeed kills Holofernes and escapes suggests, moreover, that her prayers are heard.

d) Prayers of blessing and praise (Jdt 13,17; Jdt 16)

When the people of Bethulia learn what has happened, they bless God. By this prayer, the people acknowledge that God acted through Judith, which is explicitly confirmed by the ensuing words of Uzziah. As far as the plot is concerned, this recognition of both God as the saviour of his people and Judith as the woman through whom God acted, paves the way to the definite destruction of the hostile army. Because of the appreciation of what she has done, Judith gets the authority to develop her military strategy, and because of the recognition of God's acting through her, the people of Judea gets courage and dares to act and they indeed manage to defeat the enemy.

By singing the song of victory, Judith not only confirms the real development of the events (God acted through the hand of a woman), but also predicts that God will act in the future as he did in the (past and) present (Jdt 16,17).

3. *Prayer and characterisation*

a) The prayers of Jdt 4–8

The prayers of the people in Jdt 4–5 characterise both the people and their God⁽¹⁵⁾ as being in a relationship with one another: the 'people of Israel, living in Judea' (Jdt 4,1), pray to 'the God of Israel' (Jdt 4,12). Moreover, the unity of action of the people is emphasised: all over the country men take part in the preparations for war, and cry to God. In Jerusalem, the whole people is identified as all the men, women, children, and they all cry out to God, one of mind. The example of the people concerning the prayer as well as the wearing of sackcloth is taken up by the priests as well.

The people are characterised in contrast to the enemy, who are men confident in their own strength (Jdt 2,5), whereas the people, despite all their efforts to defend themselves, ultimately trust in the power of their God. Contrary to Holofernes' idea that power is based upon military strength (cf. Jdt 5,3; 9,7), the people of Israel is portrayed as relying upon their God, whose strength is that of the powerless.

The content of the prayers reveal the fear as well as the hope of the

⁽¹⁵⁾ For prayer as part of the characterisation, see BALENTINE, *Prayer*, 48-118.

people. The people fear the effects of the enemy's victory on their children, women, cities and the sanctuary (Jdt 4,12). Yet, they hope that God will not let this happen (Jdt 4,12) if God's favour is with them (Jdt 4,15). In this way, those prayers also elucidate in which God the people trust. Their God is a God who cares for the children, the women who risk becoming prey, for the fate of Israel's cities, for his sanctuary. This God is not neutral as regards what happens to people: he is a partial God, who is supposed to act in favour of his people in danger.

Given that the praying towards a deity is a confession of which deity people serve, the actions of the Judeans make clear that their God is the Lord, the God of Israel. Apart from being a confession of faith, the mere fact of praying to another deity implies in the narrative context a firm rejection of the divine aspirations of Nebuchadnezzar. For in the opinion of Holofernes, only Nebuchadnezzar is to be worshipped and called upon (Jdt 3,8; 6,2).

Holofernes does not realise what Israel's resistance is based upon. Achior, though, is better informed. He even indicates that Israel's prayers in Egypt were answered (Jdt 5,12), which portrays the God of Israel not only as a partial but also as a trustworthy God. When the people of Bethulia learn what has happened in the hostile camp, they turn to God. In Jdt 6,19, the people are characterised in relation with both their enemy and their God, as humiliated by their enemy and consecrated to their God. God, on the other hand, is characterised as "the God of heaven", a title which was used previously by Achior. By taking over this title, the people acknowledge the truth of what Achior said. Again, this God is a partial God, who should look angrily upon the arrogance of the enemy, and favourably upon his people. Moreover, this God is described as potentially merciful towards the humiliated.

All night long, the leaders of the people as well pray to God for help (Jdt 6,21). In Jdt 7,19, the people of Bethulia see clearly God as their last resort, since they cannot escape their enemy. So over and over again the people react upon their situation of crisis with addressing their God. Against the claim that only Nebuchadnezzar is god, they believe that it is God who has the power to come to their rescue. Nevertheless, not knowing that God heard the prayers of his people (Jdt 4,13), the people lose heart. The attack of the enemy could be wanted by God to punish them for their sins and the sins of their fathers (Jdt 7,28). Still, it is their God in whom they trust (Jdt 7,29). Uziah expresses his hope that their God will not forsake them

utterly (Jdt 7,30) and that God will answer a devout woman's prayer for rain (Jdt 8,31).

All these prayers confirm the partiality of the God of Israel and his power to come to the rescue of his people. Also, the prayers build up the portrait of Israel as relying upon their God of the humiliated rather than upon military strength. The people gradually loose the hope that God will intervene. This is explained by another aspect of the relationship between God and his people: if the people sin, God may punish them (cf. Achior in Jdt 5), though even in such a context, the hope is kept alive that this God will not forsake his people for ever.

b) The prayer of Judith (Jdt 9; 10,1)

The introduction of Judith's prayer situates Judith as in line with the concerns of her people. Judith's actions of falling upon her face, putting ashes upon her head, uncovering her sackcloth are similar to the actions of the inhabitants of Jerusalem (Jdt 4,11-12). Moreover, the time of prayer is that of the offering of evening's incense in Jerusalem. By praying, Judith not only fits the image of a pious widow (cf. Jdt 8,1-8), but also fulfils the request of her leader Uzziah to intercede for the people in Bethulia (Jdt 8,31). In Jdt 9,2-4, Judith is characterised implicitly through the similarities between Simeon and Judith. Just as her forefather Simeon, she is zealous for God and will act out of abhorrence for the threatening defilement of the temple. By praying that God may act *through her*, she acknowledges the power of YHWH, and expresses her willingness to become God's instrument.

Judith's prayer characterises God in several ways: by giving him titles, by describing his deeds of the past, by describing God's power and what it exists in, and by asking him to act. God is thus characterised as: Lord God of my father Simeon (Jdt 4,2); my God (Jdt 9,4); the Lord who crushes wars, the Lord is thy name (Jdt 9,7); God of the lowly, helper of the oppressed, upholder of the weak, protector of the forlorn, saviour of those without hope, God of my father, God of the inheritance of Israel, Lord of heaven and earth, Creator of the waters, King of all thy creation (Jdt 9,11-12). With all these titles, God is on the one hand presented as the God of his people, with special concern for the weak. On the other hand, his power is emphasised: he is the Lord of heaven and earth (and not Nebuchadnezzar, cf. Jdt 2,5); he is the Creator and King over his creation. This God YHWH has the power to crush wars (Jdt 9,7, see Exod 15,3LXX).

The description of God's deeds in the past concerns his

intervention in an armed conflict by giving the sword for vengeance and by granting the victory. The requests for action deal with the defeat of the enemy as well, by breaking the strength of the opponents and giving strength to Judith. The latter moreover suggests that God can act through human hands and answers the prayers of his people.

The prayer also describes God's power and what it consists in, by description and by characterisation of the adversaries. These adversaries rely on military force for their might (see Jdt 2,5) and are arrogant and proud enough to think that they can attack the tabernacle where God's name rests. Israel's God, though, does not rely upon a large number, or on men of strength, but in being the God of the weak, of being the God who protects Israel. Judith uses this image of God as an incentive for YHWH to grant her request: as Israelite widow and a (weak) woman, she both belongs to the people YHWH protects and to the social group of the weak⁽¹⁶⁾.

c) Judith's prayers in the hostile camp (Jdt 11–13)

In the hostile camp, Judith pretends that God will answer her prayer to inform her of when her people sins. This fits her image of a traitorous woman, who came to betray her people, since they have sinned (Jdt 11,11-19). The image of God she portrays, is that of a revengeful God, who will punish his people for every transgression of his law, even when they asked to be relieved from their plight to fulfil these laws seen the context of war. This is a caricatural concretisation of Achior's statements that a God who hates iniquity is with them, so that when the Israelites depart from God's ways, they get defeated in war; and that if the people is free of guilt (literally: ἀνομία, lawlessness), their God will protect them (Jdt 5,17-18.21). Though this image of God is a caricature, Holofernes buys it.

The actual prayers of Judith characterise Judith and her God differently. Judith wants God to act through her in order to save her people, and God is the God who will protect his people by acting through her.

d) Prayers of blessing and praise (Jdt 13,17; Jdt 16)

The prayer of blessing characterises God as a God who indeed acts against the enemies of his people. The recognition of both God as the saviour of his people and Judith as the woman through whom God

⁽¹⁶⁾ Though she does certainly not fit the image of the "poor widow" in need, see Jdt 8,7.

acted, makes of Judith a woman who can speak with authority when it comes to the further destruction of the enemy.

By singing the song of victory, Judith takes up the traditional role of a woman after the battle (compare Exod 15; Judg 5; 11,34; 1 Sam 18,6), at the same time also indicating her own important role in the events. Judith portrays herself as a kind of “mother of Israel”. The enemy endangered ‘her’ young men, ‘her’ infants, ‘her’ children, ‘her’ virgins (16,5). Poetically, Judith recalls how her beauty, deceit and the sword were her weapons to defeat the enemy, in order to exalt the oppressed people of Israel.

The song characterises God as the God who crushes wars, who delivers both Judith and his people, who acts not by military force or physical strength (not by giants or Titans, Jdt 16,7), but by the hand of a woman. The song confirms the characterisation of God (and the Assyrians) as it occurred in Judith’s prayer (Jdt 9), that God’s power exists in his being the God of the oppressed indeed. By the oppressed and weak people (Jdt 16,11), the enemy was defeated. As God has acted now, he will also act in the future. He will take vengeance on those who raise against his people (Jdt 16,17). Moreover, God is portrayed as the Creator, whom all his creatures should serve (Jdt 16,14). This is contrary to the idea that all creatures should serve Nebuchadnezzar as Judith deceitfully suggested (Jdt 11,7).

4. Prayer and the theme of Judith

The main theme of the book of Judith concerns the identity of the “true” God. Two possible candidates are mentioned: Nebuchadnezzar and YHWH, the God of Israel. Many expressions said by or about Nebuchadnezzar are in biblical texts mainly or even exclusively said about YHWH. Nebuchadnezzar appropriates the power to judge and to punish “the whole earth” of which he calls himself the lord (Jdt 2,5; cf. Exod 8,18; Numb 14,21, etc.), he swears “as I live” (Jdt 2,12; cf. Ezek 5,11; Deut 32,37-41; Isa 49,18; Jer 22,34), and his hand will execute what he has spoken (Jdt 2,12; cf. Deut 32,39; Isa 43:13). Moreover, it turns out that all nations may worship only Nebuchadnezzar as their god (Jdt 3,8). Instead of this worldly power which claims to be god, the people of Israel support their own God, the Lord God of Israel.

Holofernes is the champion of Nebuchadnezzar, ready to defend his claim by brutal military force. Judith (and the Israelites) counter his attack while claiming that the God of Israel is the God of all power and might. Judith manages to defeat Holofernes with his own

weapons: deceit⁽¹⁷⁾ and the sword, not by relying on military or physical strength as the Assyrians do, but by her confidence in the might of the God of the weak. The prayers in the book of Judith contribute in their own way to this overall theme.

Apart from the preparations for war, the people pray. In the context of an attack by a king with divine aspirations, such a prayer is choosing against Nebuchadnezzar and for YHWH, the God of Israel. Over and over again, military resistance is linked with prayer. The military resistance of the people and their leaders is consequently that of persevering passive resistance, relying on God's intervention. Such a strategy was successful in the similar story of Isaiah 36–37. Yet, the prayer of Judith works out another way of resisting the enemy: the active counter attack, based upon the belief that God may act through her hands. Judith's song (Jdt 16) answers the question of the true God by singing about the victory of God who is the God who crushes wars, who delivers both Judith and his people, who acts not by military force or physical strength, but by the hand of a woman.

The resistance of the people raises the question what the power of Israel exists in. Holofernes' questions to his military council betray in what the power of people should, in his view, exist: the strength of their cities, their army, their king, their military leader (Jdt 5,3). His council will mention the location of the village on the heights of the mountains as the basis for their confidence (Jdt 7,10), which informs more on the enemy's ideas of power than on those of Israel (cf. already Jdt 2,5). Judith's prayer characterises this attitude of the enemy: "they glory in the strength of their foot soldiers; they trust in shield and spear, in bow and sling" (Jdt 9,7). From such a perspective on power, and given the superior military force of Nebuchadnezzar, Holofernes cannot imagine that the people can rely upon another God.

Achior, though, offers Holofernes a more correct insight into the power of Israel. In his view, a God who hates iniquity is with Israel. As long as they do not sin, their God will protect them (Jdt 5,17-21). Interestingly, the people of Bethulia take into account the possibility that God punishes them (or their fathers) for their sins. Judith, on the other hand, claims that the people have not acknowledged any other deity than God. Therefore, they may rely on God (Jdt 8,28). In her deceit, she takes up the idea of sin again. She lies to Holofernes that

⁽¹⁷⁾ Note that Holofernes, who claims that Nebuchadnezzar only is god, promises to serve the God of Judith (Jdt 11,23), which is a straightforward lie.

her people are about to sin, and suggests that at that moment God's anger will come over them so that Holofernes may defeat them, which moment will be revealed to her in prayer. Yet, all along her actions keep up to her faith as expressed in her prayer: that the true God to be served is the God of the powerless, whom the people of Israel serves.

In her extensive prayer, Judith explicitly mentions in what the might of this God exists and in what it does not: "thou art the Lord who crushes wars; the Lord is thy name. Break their strength by thy might ... for thy power depends not upon numbers, nor thy might upon men of strength; for thou art God of the lowly, helper of the oppressed, upholder of the weak, protector of the forlorn, saviour of those without hope" (Jdt 9,7-8.11). Of this line of thought, that with God strength is not based upon military power but on the God of the powerless, the prayers of the people are an important part.

The final song, which can be read as an assessment of all the events, again proclaims this God whose strength does not rely on military force or physical strength (not on giants or Titans, Jdt 16,7) , but is revealed 'through the hand of a woman'.

*
* *

If praying implies the idea that God hears the prayer, prayer influences the plot. This basic hypothesis was confirmed by our analysis of the book of Judith. Moreover, it became clear that characterisation and plot are closely linked in this regard. Exactly because God is portrayed as a partial God one may expect this God to act when his people under attack cry unto him for help. By praying, a character also indicates in which deity he/she believes. Since the book of Judith contains two candidates for the title of 'true god', the people of Israel resist Nebuchadnezzar's claim by praying. Prayer thus becomes resistance.

This result of our analysis raises new research questions. Which rules are to be taken into account for a prayer to become a performative action? Which conventions, circumstances, characters, procedures, etc. play a role in turning a discourse into performative speech? In how far do those rules also apply for other discursive text-elements? If prayer is more than words spoken, if it is action, then the theory of 'performative speech' ⁽¹⁸⁾ could be helpful for elucidating the

⁽¹⁸⁾ As formulated by J.L. AUSTIN, *How to Do Things with Words* (eds. J.O. URMSON – M. SBISA) (Oxford – New York, NY 1962).

function of this kind of discourse, not only in the book of Judith, but also in other biblical texts.

Catholic University Leuven (Belgium) S. VAN DEN EYNDE
Elfnovemberlaan 36
3010 Kessel-Lo Belgium

SUMMARY

If prayers are defined as communication in which prayers receive a response from God, this implies that they have a function as regards the plot of a story. As a test case, the impact of praying on the plot as well as the characterisation in the book of Judith (containing 21 references to praying) is analysed. The specific characterisation of God through prayer affects the plot. Apart from their importance for characterisation and plot, the prayers in Judith contribute in their own way to the development of its main theme: who is truly God, Nebuchadnezzar or YHWH?

ANIMADVERSIONES

Metamorphosis of a Ferocious Pharaoh

The account of the plagues opens with a fantastic claim: ‘YHWH has given Moses (as) a God for Pharaoh and Aaron is his prophet’ (Exod 7,1). P’s account of the ensuing contest is a theomachy mounting an extremely harsh onslaught against Egypt in sharp contrast with the Priestly writer’s overall non-violent stance⁽¹⁾. YHWH hardens Pharaoh’s heart and Pharaoh increases oppression. Aaron’s rod is thrown at Pharaoh’s face (לפניו)⁽²⁾, the rod changes into a dragon-gobbling dragon (תנין Exod 7,8-12), a feat that only hardens the king’s heart (Exod 7,13).

Most translators have resisted the straightforward rendering of *tannin* as “dragon”⁽³⁾ because dictionaries insist that in Biblical Hebrew *tannin* also means “serpent” or “crocodile” in spite of the fact that in cognate languages and in modern Arabic *tannin* only refers to a fabulous “sea-monster, dragon”⁽⁴⁾. The meaning “serpent” is adduced from Deut 32,33 and Ps 91,13 where *tannin* is used in parallel with the earthly *peten* “horned viper”, although the *peten* itself is not entirely devoid of mythological connotations in cognate languages⁽⁵⁾. But the main cluster of support for “serpent” is Exod 7,9.10.12 discussed below. The meaning “crocodile” is inferred from Ezek 29,3; 32,2. However, these naturalistic translations greatly weaken the potential of the text of Exodus and Ezekiel.

1. No Mundane Crocodile in Ezekiel

Ezek 29,3-5; 32,2-6 envision Pharaoh as a huge reptile wallowing in the Nile⁽⁶⁾. Commentators on these passages regularly embark on tame-the-*tannin* missions. Daniel Block affirms that “Ezekiel’s *tannin* has been thoroughly historicized, being compared with the king of Egypt” although he admits in a footnote that “it is still tempting to see here an allusion to the

⁽¹⁾ A. DE PURY, “Der priesterschriftliche Umgang mit der Jakobsgeschichte”, *Schriftauslegung in der Schrift* (Hrsg. R.G. KRATZ – T. KRÜGER – K. SCHMID) (Berlin 2000) 39, uses the negative depiction of Pharaoh to date Pg just before Cambyse’s conquest of Egypt.

⁽²⁾ Rather than ‘thrown down in front of Pharaoh’ as in 4,3.

⁽³⁾ A quick look at about 70 European translations provided by *BibleWorks 5* reveals that only a few render *tannin* as a mythological figure: Bfblia Catalana Interconfessional, Český Ekumenický Preklad, Leidse Vertaling, NVB San Paulo Edizione, Young’s Literal Translation (monster).

⁽⁴⁾ *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (eds. M.E.J. RICHARDSON et al.) (Leiden 1999) IV 1764-1765.

⁽⁵⁾ See Akk. *bašmu* and Ugaritic *btm* put in parallel with *tannin* as in Deut 32,33 and Ps 91,13 and rendered “Indeed I muzzled Tannin, I silenced him; I smote the windy serpent”: M. DAHOOD, *Psalms 51-100* (AB; Garden City, NY 1968) 333; Sir 39,30.

⁽⁶⁾ W.H.C. PROPP, *Exodus 1-18* (AB; New York 1998) 324.

Egyptian crocodile god Sobek” (7). Because Ezek 29,3-5 link the fate of the Nile’s fish with Pharaoh’s, Block insists that the *tannim* “refers concretely to a marine creature, in this instance a crocodile” (8). In this case, one should note that *Crocodilus nilotus* is not known to share with *Crocodilus porosus* the habit of swimming out to sea (9).

In the same demythologising vein, Moshe Greenberg appeals to Exodus 7 to support the view that although the Ugaritic and Hebrew *tannim* is a mythical primeval sea monster (Isa 51:9; Job 7,12) (10), Ezekiel’s *tannim* also denotes a mundane creature found in Egypt. Greenberg thus accuses John Day of ignoring ‘the mundane *tannim* of priestly literature’, although a few lines below Greenberg admits “to be sure, in ch. 32 Ezekiel does draw on a richer mythical vocabulary, including terms associated with the mythical *tannim*” (11). So why insist that the great *tannim* (תַּנִּינִים הַנְּדִינִים) of Ezek 29 is also a mere crocodile (12)? In fact, there is no need to wait until chapter 32 to find mythological imagery. In Ezek 29, the *tannim* is fished out of his Nile with all the fishes of the river stuck to his scales, a miraculous catch indeed. Instead of eating the daring fisherman and walking back to the Nile, Ezekiel’s *tannim* rots away in the desert. And Greenberg, who has just insisted that Ezekiel’s *tannim* is a mundane crocodile, now accuses Ezekiel of inconsistency: ‘Ezekiel may not have been familiar with the amphibious nature of the crocodile’ (13)!

No, Ezekiel’s understanding of the *tannim* is thoroughly mythological (14) and his *tannim* cannot be reduced to a mere crocodile, however fierce crocodiles may be. Now the second question is whether the *tannin* of Exodus 7 is a mere snake.

2. Exodus 7: Dragons and Snakes, but Mythical Ones

References to *tannin* in Exod 7,1-13 are attributed to P^s (15); while the next section (Exod 7,14-18) belongs to another literary stratum. There is no need here to decide to whom belongs the non-P material (16). What matters is to note that verse 15 refers to Aaron’s rod as “the rod that was turned into a snake” (נָחָשׁ) while in verses 8-12 P consistently mentions *tannin*. Does this avoidance of the term *tannin* reflect a tame-the-dragon process, an attempt at demythologizing P’s text?

Rather than turning P’s dragon into a mundane adder, verses 14-18 take P’s mythological imagery to surprising lengths:

(7) D.I. BLOCK, *The Book of Ezekiel* (Grand Rapids – Cambridge 1998) 137 and n. 44; quoting E. BROVARSKI, “Sobek”, *LÄ V*, 999-1000.

(8) BLOCK, *Ezekiel*, 137.

(9) *Encyclopaedia Britannica. Macropaedia* (Chicago 1992) XXVI, 721.

(10) L.I.J. STADELMANN, *The Hebrew Conception of the World* (AnBib 39; Rome 1970) 20-27; quoted by J.I. DURHAM, *Exodus* (WBC, 3; Waco 1987) 91; and PROPP, *Exodus*, 322.

(11) M. GREENBERG, *Ezekiel 21-37* (AB 22A; New York 1997) 601-602.

(12) BLOCK, *Ezekiel*, 137.

(13) GREENBERG, *Ezekiel*, 603.

(14) Pace GREENBERG, *Ezekiel*, 601.

(15) According to N. LOHFINK, *Theology of the Pentateuch* (Edinburgh 1994) 145 n. 29, and PROPP, *Exodus*, 262, 286, only Exod 7,1-13.19.20*.21b.22 belong to P^s.

(16) See discussion by PROPP, *Exodus*, 310-317.

לך אל־פרעה בבקר הנה יצא המימה ונצבת לקראתו על־שפת היאר
והמטה אשר־נהפך לנחש תקח בידך

Go to Pharaoh in the morning, behold he is coming out to the water, stand by to meet him at the river bank, and the staff that was turned into a snake take in your hand (Exod 7,15).

YHWH orders Moses to intercept Pharaoh in the morning as he is going to the water. Why in the morning and why to the waters? Is Pharaoh going for his morning bath? Or are these hints at theomachy rather than at hygiene?

In Egypt, the "Repulsing of the Dragon" motif is found in various temple and private rituals and is included in Coffin texts where the enemy dragon is identified as Sobek the crocodile god or as Apophis the snake god threatening to devour the solar boat⁽¹⁷⁾. Seth's standard posture is thus at the prow of the solar bark, lancing a huge reptile⁽¹⁸⁾. As a god for Pharaoh (Exod 7,1), Moses mimics Baal/Seth striking the Apophis serpent, rod in hand ready to mete out YHWH's punishment on Egypt⁽¹⁹⁾. The dragon is obviously most dangerous during the night or as evening draws close (v. 5), as the sun is waning. Conversely, morning is Ra's moment of mounting glory, when the dragon has to lie low (Ps 104,22), waiting for more propitious times to attack the divine vessel. A pharaoh hurrying to the waters in the morning is thus a transmutation of the king into the enemy dragon. Egyptian theology had already worked out a "Pharaoh-friendly" link between Pharaoh and the Dragon, with the Sobek-Re liaison whereby Sobek assumed solar features⁽²⁰⁾. In Exod 7, the process is simply reversed and Pharaoh, the "son of Ra" in Egyptian royal ideology⁽²¹⁾, turns into Ra's main enemy. From a Hebraic vantage point, pharaohs and other heads of empire do behave like dragons, gobbling up people and kingdoms⁽²²⁾.

Rather than demythologizing P's dragon, Exod 7,14-18 is an exact reflex

⁽¹⁷⁾ ANET, 11-12; and *Context of Scripture* (ed. W.W. HALLO) (Leiden 1997) I, 21. B.F. BATTO, *Slaying The Dragon*. Mythmaking in the Biblical Tradition (Westminster 1992); J.K. HOFFMEIER, "The Arm of God versus the Arm of Pharaoh in the Exodus Narratives", *Bib* 67 (1986) 378-387. Sobek is associated with the Nile and the river banks: D.M. DOXEY, "Sobek", *Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt* (ed. D.B. REDFORD) (Oxford 2001) III, 300.

⁽¹⁸⁾ ANEP, 669; O. KEEL, *The Symbolism of the Biblical World* (London 1978) 54-55, 224.

⁽¹⁹⁾ O. KEEL – Chr. UEHLINGER, *Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God* (Minneapolis 1998) 76-79; O. KEEL – S. SCHROER, *Schoepfung* (Freiburg – Göttingen 2002) 128-130; H. BRUNNER, "Seth und Apophis – Gegengötter im ägyptischen Pantheon?", *Das hörende Herz. Kleine Schriften zur Religions- und Geistesgeschichte Ägyptens* (Hrsg. W. RÖLLIG – H. BRUNNER) (OBO 80; Freiburg – Göttingen 1983/1988) 121-129.

⁽²⁰⁾ Sobek, the crocodile deity of Crocodilopolis in the Faiyum, became the god of the Pharaohs of the Twelfth Dynasty (XXth – XVIIIth centuries) and then experienced a real ascendancy in the Eighteenth Dynasty (XVIth – XIVth centuries): S. MORENZ, *Egyptian Religion* (London 1973) 140-141; V. IONS, *Egyptian Mythology* (Feltham 1968) 93.

⁽²¹⁾ J. ASSMANN, *Egyptian Solar Religion in the New Kingdom*. Re, Amun and the Crisis of Polytheism (London 1995). Letter to Zalaia from Kumidi: "the king is well like the sun in heaven", *Context of Scripture*, III, 243. Most of the Amarna letters address Pharaoh as "to the king, my Lord, my Sun": W.L. MORAN, *The Amarna Letters* (Baltimore – London 1992).

⁽²²⁾ Nebuchadrezzar in Jer 51,34 and the Babylonians in Lam 2,19. Less directly: the Assyrians (Isa 28,4; 49,19; Hos 8,7); David and Joab (2 Sam 20,19).

of Ezek 29,3-5; 32,2-6⁽²³⁾ that envisions Pharaoh as a huge mythical reptile wallowing in the river⁽²⁴⁾. The image is not taken any further because the editors are bound to follow P's narrative which at this point still requires a human pharaoh. So the first strike of the magical rod is not aimed at the king but at the waters that turn into blood (Exod 7,17-23).

That editors inserted into P's narrative a depiction of Pharaoh that draws on Ezekielian imagery confirms Risa Kohn's claim that "although traditional scholarship generally highlights Ezekiel's affinity to P, it is truly the redactor of the Torah (R) he most resembles"⁽²⁵⁾. The "dragonization" of Pharaoh in Exod 7,15 is one more clue to the editing of P by scribes well-versed in Ezekiel or by an "Ezekielian school" that was involved in editing the Torah.

3. Ben Sira and the Stinking Tannin

If modern Bible translators do not like dragons, in the second century BCE, Jesus Ben Sira was not embarrassed by mythical dragons. On the contrary, only a mythical reading makes sense of a cryptic verse in the Hebrew of Sira 3,24 (Greek and English = 3,26)⁽²⁶⁾:

לב כבד/תבאש אחריתו ואורב טובות ינהג בהם

Hardened heart, his hind part will stink and he who loves "goodnesses" will be lead away by them.

This verse clearly alludes to Exodus 7, packing into eight words two expressions found in Exod 7: לב כבד in the negative sense as in Exod 7-10 and באש 'to stink' (Exod 7,18.21). Pharaoh is dubbed as 'hardened heart' that will end up badly due to an inordinate love of goodness, which appears paradoxical, unless goodness here is ironical. The nature of this goodness is not given, but it can be nothing else than the water by which Pharaoh will perish when pursuing the Israelites! Ben Sira has thus seen that Pharaoh's going to the water is not motivated by hygienic reasons but by an inordinate love of Nile waters because, as Ezekiel 29 explains, Pharaoh considers the Nile as his own and loves to wallow in it.

Because he wrote in Egypt and owed his safety to a Ptolemaic Pharaoh⁽²⁷⁾, Ben Sira was indeed careful in his depiction of the Exodus Pharaoh, although he did not resist cracking this rude joke by alluding to the king's fate and to his anatomical end part.

Ben Sira's grandson who came to Egypt to translate the text into Greek

⁽²³⁾ PROPP, *Exodus*, 310.

⁽²⁴⁾ PROPP, *Exodus*, 324; R.L. KOHN, "A Prophet like Moses? Rethinking Ezekiel's Relationship to the Torah", *ZAW* 114 (2, 2002) 236-254 (236).

⁽²⁵⁾ KOHN, "Prophet", 251. See also R.L. KOHN, *A New Heart and a New Soul*. Ezekiel, the Exile and the Torah (JSOTSS 358; Sheffield 2002); and already J.D. LEVENSON, *Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40-48* (HSM 10; Missoula 1976); J.L. SKA, "La sortie d'Egypte (Ex 7-14) dans le récit sacerdotal (Pg) et la tradition prophétique", *Bib* 60 (1979) 203-215; H. MCKEATING, "Ezekiel the 'Prophet Like Moses'?", *JSOT* 61 (1994) 97-100; B. GOSSE, "Le livre d'Ézéchiél et Ex 6,2-8 dans le cadre du Pentateuque", *BN* 104 (2000) 20-25.

⁽²⁶⁾ I. LÉVY, *The Hebrew Text of the Wisdom of Ecclesiasticus* (Leiden 1969) 2, considers this verse as unintelligible.

⁽²⁷⁾ P. MCKECHNIE, "The Career of Joshua Ben Sira", *JThS* 51 (2000) 1-26.

demurred at his grandfather's monstrosity and improved the verse to make it more amenable to the Greek-speaking court of Alexandria:

Καρδία σκληρὰ κακωθήσεται ἐπ' ἐσχάτων καὶ ὁ ἀγαπῶν κίνδυνον ἐν αὐτῷ ἀπολείται

A stubborn mind will fare badly at the end, and whoever loves danger will perish in it.

The Greek moves away from the Hebrew anatomical description of the beastly Pharaoh by choosing the temporal sense of אַחֲרַיִת and dropping completely the idea of stench conveyed by בַּאֲשׁ. The Greek also transforms מְרִיבָה into κίνδυνος "danger", "war" or "hazardous enterprise" to give the verse a moral bent. The pun is turned into a proverb. However, the critical turn of the whole verse is kept, in contrast to the ambiguous translation offered by Skehan and Di Lella: '... and he who loves what is good will be brought along by it'⁽²⁸⁾. The beloved goodness here is ironic and refers to Pharaoh's love for wallowing in the Nile.

To conclude, neither Exodus, nor Ezekiel present the *tannin* as a mundane reptile. Although they call the *tannin* "snake", the editors of P^s develop a full-scale mythological narrative that *Entmythologisierende* snakes and bathing pharaohs water down beyond recovery.

Near East School of Theology
PO Box 13-5780 Chouran
Beirut

Ph. GUILLAUME

SUMMARY

The common translation of the *tannin* of Exodus 7 as a mere snake misses the powerful mythological overtones of the whole passage. The editors of Pg are drawing on imagery from Ezekiel to mythologize Moses' morning encounter with Pharaoh on the river bank. Ben Sira was well aware of these connotations and turned them into a joke against Pharaoh.

⁽²⁸⁾ P.W. SKEHAN – A.A. DI LELLA, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (AB 39; Garden City, NY 1987) 163.

“The Haughtiness of the Priesthood” (Isa 65,5)

Several scholars detect critique of the priesthood in Isa 56–66 ⁽¹⁾. Most noteworthy is Paul Hanson who argues that most of the oracles in Isa 56–66 are aimed at what he labels “the theocratic party” ⁽²⁾. Others, for example Geiger ⁽³⁾ and Rofé, limit the prophetic critique of the priests to the first verses in Isa 66 ⁽⁴⁾. Based on his careful exegesis of 66,3, Rofé argues that the legitimate rituals mentioned in the first statement of each couplet can only be identified with those taking place in the temple in Jerusalem. Furthermore, the performance of these rites was the exclusive prerogative of the priests. In view of this, he concludes that Isa 66,3 is an oracle against the Jerusalem priesthood ⁽⁵⁾.

Rofé’s article has received a variety of scholarly responses. Blenkinsopp adopts his identification of the people in 66,3 with the priests in the Jerusalem temple, and he regards them as being “addicted to syncretistic cult” ⁽⁶⁾. In contrast, Smith, in view of his claim that Isa 65,1–66,4 form one literary unit, argues that Isa 65,1–7 and 66,3 refer to the same activities and have the same target audience. Assuming a wider scope of the latter verses, he draws the conclusion that the prophet’s criticism goes beyond the priesthood’s participation in syncretistic rituals ⁽⁷⁾.

⁽¹⁾ The present article builds on a small part of my doctoral thesis “Priestly Rites and Prophetic Rage. Early Post-Exilic Prophetic Critique of the Priesthood”, University of Oxford, 2002. In this article, I have extended my discussion of the different aspects of Isa 65,5, in particular of the perceived contradiction between 65,3–4 and 66,3. I have also added several issues, e.g. the discussion whether קדש־יִשְׂרָאֵל should be understood comparably or as introducing a dative, and the understanding of the *Sitz-im-Leben* of Isa 65,5. I wish to thank first and foremost Prof. H.G.M. Williamson who supervised my thesis. Further, I am indebted to Ina J. Hartmann who proof-read the final draft of this article.

⁽²⁾ P.D. HANSON, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia 1975).

⁽³⁾ A. GEIGER, *Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit von der innern Entwicklung des Judenthums* (Breslau 1857) 56. He is to my knowledge the first scholar who identifies the people accused in Isa 66,1–5 with those serving as priests in the temple.

⁽⁴⁾ There is no consensus among scholars concerning the extent of the oracle in the beginning of Isa 66. There is, however, convincing evidence supporting the textual unity of Isa 66,1–6. See especially E.C. WEBSTER, “A Rhetorical Study of Isaiah 66”, *JSOT* 34 (1986) 93–108. He is followed by W.A.M. BEUKEN, “Does Trito-Isaiah Reject the Temple? An Intertextual Inquiry into Isa. 66.1–6”, *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings*. Essays in Honour of Bas van Iersel (ed. S. DRAISMA) (Kampen 1989) 60. Most recently, J. GOLDENSTEIN, *Das Gebet der Gottesknechte*. Jesaja 63,7–64,11 im Jesajabuch (WBANT 92; Neukirchen-Vluyn 2001) 216–217, and B.S. CHILDS, *Isaiah* (OTL; Louisville, KY 2001) 539–541, both relate to 66,1–6 as a literary unit.

⁽⁵⁾ A. ROFÉ, “Isaiah 66,1–4: Judean Sects in the Persian Period as Viewed by Trito-Isaiah”, *Biblical and Related Studies Presented To Samuel Iwry* (eds. A. KORT – S. MORSCHAUER) (Winona Lake 1985) 209–212.

⁽⁶⁾ J. BLENKINSOPP, “A Jewish Sect of the Persian Period”, *CBQ* 52 (1990) 10, 17.

⁽⁷⁾ P.A. SMITH, *Rhetoric and Redaction in Trito-Isaiah*. The Structure, Growth and Authorship of Isaiah 56–66 (VTSup 62; Leiden 1996) 158.

In this article, I set out to prove that there is no inherent contradiction accepting both the extended unity of 65,1–66,4(6)⁽⁸⁾ and a priestly target of 66,3. Instead, there is evidence of critique of the priesthood especially in 65,5. The people who are targeted in 65,1-7 are quoted in v. 5, saying קרב אליך אל-תגשבי כי קדשתיך. I shall attempt to determine the most likely interpretation of this phrase and, on this basis, argue that the speakers should be identified with the Judahite priests.

1. The grammatical understanding of Isa 65,5

The speakers in 65,5 say three things:

1. קרב אליך
2. אל-תגשבי
3. כי קדשתיך

It seems likely that the first and the second statements convey the same information.

The first expression קרב אליך can be translated literally as “come close to yourself”. Such a rendering, however, fits ill with the immediately following phrase אל-תגשבי which is a simple command to someone not to come near the speaker: “do not draw near to me”. Hence, קרב אליך is often translated as “stand by yourself”, in the sense “do *not* come near me”⁽⁹⁾. In support of such an interpretation, the similar expression גש-הלאה in Gen 19,9 seems to indicate “stand back from there” rather than the literal “approach onwards”. Similarly, Isa 49,20 attests ואשב-הלי in a context where it is clear that the people addressed should leave. Hence, the translation of קרב אליך as “do not come near” is plausible, despite the different verb and the fact that the following preposition denotes the person addressed (קרב אליך) rather than the person speaking (גש-הלי). Such an interpretation is also supported by the major versions: the LXX (πόσσω ἄπ’ ἐμοῦ), Vg (*Recede a me*), TJ (רחק להלאה) and S (פרוק להל) all carry a sense of withdrawal, either “from me” (LXX, Vg) or “from there” (TJ and S).

The reason for this command is given in the third statement, כי קדשתיך. This expression is problematic on several levels. On a purely grammatical one, the MT קדשתיך is pointed as a *Qal* which is normally intransitive⁽¹⁰⁾. However, קדשתיך here carries an object suffix. There are two possible understanding of this. We may either assume that the stative *Qal*, normally meaning “to be holy, set apart”, can take an object, to be rendered “to be holier than somebody”. Alternatively, we may reposit the verb to a transitive *Piel*, to be translated “to sanctify/ consecrate somebody”.

Most of the ancient translations understand this verb intransitively. LXX writes ὅτι καθαρὸς εἰμι = “because I am pure” using the word καθαρὸς = “pure” rather than “holy”, and does not attest an object. Similarly, S renders

⁽⁸⁾ See footnote 4.

⁽⁹⁾ *Mikra’ot Gedolot ‘Haketer’*. A revised and augmented scientific edition of ‘Mikra’ot Gedolot’. Based on the Aleppo Codex and early Medieval MSS (ed. M. COHEN) (Ramat-Gan 1996), Isa 65,5.

⁽¹⁰⁾ BDB, 872-873, list two translations: *Qal* 1. “be consecrated”, *Qal* 2. “be hallowed” (“by contact with sacred things, and so tabooed from profane use, or forfeit to sanctuary”).

מקדש אֵא = “because I am holy” without an object. The Syriac form מקדש may support a *Piel* rather than a *Paal* in its *Vorlage*, but it could also show dependence on the LXX⁽¹¹⁾. TJ renders the saying as אֵרִי אֵא דְכִינָא מִנְךָ, understanding the object suffix as a matter of comparison, i.e., “holier than you”, as does Symmachus: ἁγιώτερός σου. Finally, the Latin translation found in Origen’s Hexapla reads *sanctus sum tibi* = “I am holy for you”, which supports an understanding of the Hebrew text as taking a dative “with reference to you, I am holy”. The standard Vulgate text differs drastically from the other major versions with its reading *quia immundus es* = “because you are unclean”. This, however, is probably an interpretation rather than evidence of a different Hebrew *Vorlage*.

To sum up, the understanding of the verbal suffix as an indirect object is supported by most of the ancient translations, either understanding it as a dative (holy to/ for you) or as a comparative (holier than you).

Looking at how different scholars have understood this expression, we find that most mediaeval commentators advocate the latter sense, i.e. they understand the verbal suffix in a comparative sense. For example, Rashi writes אֵרִי קדוֹשׁ מִנְךָ וְשִׁהְרִי יוֹתֵר מִנְךָ and Radak and Ibn Ezra interpret אֵרִי קדוֹשׁ מִנְךָ. In support of the idea of an intransitive verb taking an object suffix, Ibn Ezra compares קדוֹשׁ with Jer 10,20 יֵצְאוּנִי.

In contrast, several early critical scholars render the verbal suffix as a dative. For example, Gesenius–Kautzsch compare קדוֹשׁ with Zech 7,5 אֵרִי הֲצִוִּיתִי צִמָּה לָאֵלֹהִים = “did you fast at all for me” and with Job 31,18 גִּדְלִי כִּאֲבִי = “he grew up to me as to a father”, where the indirect object is directly subordinated in the form of an accusative suffix⁽¹²⁾. In this context, Delitzsch draws attention to Jer 20,7 הִזְקִינִי = “you overpowered me”, i.e. you were strong to me) and Isa 44,21 לֹא תִשְׁכַּח (אֵרִי = “you will not be forgotten by me”), where the verbal suffixes indicate the dative. In view of this, Delitzsch translates “Ich bin dir heilig d.i. unnahbar”, by which the speaker would mean that he is unapproachable⁽¹³⁾. Along similar lines, Torrey translates “I am taboo for thee”⁽¹⁴⁾.

The Masoretic pointing is, however, not accepted by all commentators. For example, Geiger repoints the verb to a *Piel* and translates “bleibe bei dir, komm’ mir nicht zu nahe, sonst weihe ich dich”. In support of his repointing, he claims that the current punctuation is a result of the Pharisaic *Halacha*, which, seeking to “liberate” the text of any indication that holiness could be contagious, changed an original *Piel* to the now attested *Qal*⁽¹⁵⁾. This

⁽¹¹⁾ D. BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament* (OBO 50/2; Göttingen 1986) II, 454.

⁽¹²⁾ GKC, §117x.

⁽¹³⁾ F. DELITZSCH, *Das Buch Jesaia* (Leipzig 1889) 616.

⁽¹⁴⁾ C.C. TORREY, *The Second Isaiah* (New York 1928) 468. Other scholars supporting the MT are for example BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique*, II, 454, J.A. EMERTON, “Notes on the Text and Translation of Isaiah XXII 8-11 and LXV 5”, *VT* 30 (1980) 446-450, who translates “for I am holy to thee” i.e. “for I am too sacred for you”, S. ACKERMAN, *Under Every Green Tree*. Popular Religion in Sixth-Century Judah (HSM 46; Atlanta, GA 1992) 167, n. 11, B. SCHRAMM, *The Opponents of Third Isaiah. Reconstruction of the Cultic History of the Restoration* (JSOTSS 193; Sheffield 1995) 157, and SMITH, *Rhetoric*, 137, n. 31.

⁽¹⁵⁾ GEIGER, *Urschrift*, 56, 172-173.

emendation is followed by many critical scholars⁽¹⁶⁾, due mostly to the rarity of an object suffix attached to an intransitive verb.

To conclude, it is grammatically possible to maintain the attested *Qal* form. In fact, the very rarity of this form may support its originality. In other words, it is easier to explain the intransitive reading of LXX, despite its lack of object, as a derivative from a tradition attesting the unusual *Qal* reading, rather than as a conscious change from the more common *Piel* form. Furthermore, in response to Geiger's claim, it is noteworthy that the Masoretes left the *Piel* in Ezek 44,19 unchanged. Therefore, the attested *Qal* form is in my view original.

Furthermore, it is not an easy task to determine whether the verbal suffix should be rendered as a comparative "than" or introducing a dative "to/ for". It depends on the immediate context of the verb in question. Nevertheless, a comparative sense for קדשתיך seems preferable in view of the example from Jer 20,7 (חזקתני) which ideally should be translated "you are stronger than I am". Hence, קדשתיך may best be as "I am holier than you", thus stating that the speakers in v. 5 regard themselves as holier than their immediate surroundings.

2. The identity of the speakers

Our conclusion above that the speakers in v. 5 considered themselves as holier than their surroundings gives us useful insight concerning their identity.

First, how should קדשתיך be interpreted in the present context? This verb has often been understood to refer not to the "standard" holiness transmitted by YHWH but to a supernatural power given to the speakers as the result of the previously described rites. The use of the root קדש here would thus be blasphemous⁽¹⁷⁾. As far as I am aware, however, this root always refers to holiness connected with YHWH, either attributed to Himself or to the sanctification by Him of a human being/ thing/ place. Therefore, it is in my view more likely that קדשתיך here also refers to holiness in relation to YHWH rather than to any sanctification stemming from contact with another deity.

Secondly, this claim of holiness is commonly understood as the result of the activities described earlier. The syntax of vv. 3-5, where each claim is introduced with an active participle, however, does not indicate a relationship between the different statements as one of cause and result. Instead, my proposal is that this claim of holiness is an indication of the identity of the people speaking, holiness being their normative state. The category of people most suitable for this kind of label is the priesthood.

Hanson, coming from another direction, suggests a different reason for

⁽¹⁶⁾ E.g., B. DUHM, *Das Buch Jesaja* (Göttingen 1922) 476, C. VON ORELLI, *Der Prophet Jesaja* (KKAT; München 1904) 220, K. MARTI, *Das Buch Jesaja* (KHAT; Tübingen 1900) 402, P. VOLZ, *Jesaja* (KAT; Leipzig 1932) II, 279, n. k, T.K. CHEYNE, *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah* (London 1895) 368, n. 1, J.L. MCKENZIE, *Second Isaiah* (AB 20; Garden City 1968) 194.

⁽¹⁷⁾ E.g., MCKENZIE, *Isaiah*, 195, J.D. SMART, *History and Theology in Second Isaiah. A Commentary on Isaiah 35, 40-66* (London 1967) 277, and R.N. WHYBRAY, *Isaiah 40-66* (NCBC; Grand Rapids 1975) 270.

such an identification. He argues that the root נגש, together with the expressions קרב אליך and קדשתך, all occurring in 65,5, are "three of the cardinal technical terms in the priestly language". The root נגש is attested in priestly contexts in, e.g., Exod 24,2; 28,43; 30,20; Lev 21,21; Ezek 44,5, 13, 15, while the verb קרב occurs in Exod 40,32; Lev 9,7-8; 21,17; 22,3; Ezek 40,46; 42,14 etc.⁽¹⁸⁾. He also interprets the expression על פני in Isa 65,3 as an allusion to the temple⁽¹⁹⁾.

Smith criticizes Hanson's view by pointing out that the expression על פני is often used as a simple preposition "before" rather than carrying any cultic overtones. Further, while accepting that the terms נגש, קרב אליך and קדשתך are examples of priestly language, he denies that they indicate "orthodox cultic activity" in the present context⁽²⁰⁾. From a different angle, Schramm uncovers Hanson's inconsistency, in that the latter interprets v. 5 literally while viewing the accusations in vv. 3-4 metaphorically. Instead, Schramm suggests that all the verses should be taken at face value, describing the struggle in the restoration period to establish the orthodox cult of YHWH⁽²¹⁾.

I agree with Schramm that the rituals in vv. 3-4 indicate actual religious rites which at the time were practiced by people in Judah. Given this, it is possible that some of these rituals may have been part of the worship of YHWH, as understood from the worshippers' own perspective. As such, it cannot be excluded that the priesthood in Judah participated in them. Thus, while Schramm's critique of Hanson's metaphorical reading of vv. 3-4 can be sustained, an identification of the speakers in v. 5 with the priests should not be ruled out. In fact, given the similarity in content between 65,3-4 and 66,3, noted above and assumed to be an obstacle in identifying the target audience of 66,3 with the priesthood, we may actually see the parallels between 65,3-5 and 66,3 as supporting a priestly identity in both places. In other words, the people targeted in both these places are associated with holiness, either by considering themselves to be holy or by performing holy rituals. Furthermore, they are accused of being involved in non-orthodox worship of YHWH and/or other deities. Taking these factors together, the most likely interpretation is one of shared identity. Hence, once we acknowledge the possibility that the post-exilic clergy could have been involved in less-than-orthodox rituals, we are free to draw the conclusion that most likely, both 65,3-5 and 66,3 criticize those same priests.

Concerning Smith's objections, I agree that על פני is probably not an allusion to the temple. Even so, Hanson's identification of the priestly terms נגש, קרב and קדש may remain: while נגש and קרב occur in several contexts other than priestly, they carry priestly connotations in many texts and the root קדש is by its very meaning part of the cultic vocabulary. Taking them separately,

⁽¹⁸⁾ HANSON, *Dawn* 147-149. His view is adopted by E. ACHEMEIER, *The Community and the Message of Isaiah 56-66. A Theological Commentary* (Augsburg 1982) 123-124. For a complete list of attested examples, see HANSON, *Dawn*, 149. Note, however, that he interprets קדשתך as a *Piel*, an understanding I do not share.

⁽¹⁹⁾ HANSON, *Dawn*, 147.

⁽²⁰⁾ SMITH, *Rhetoric*, 137.

⁽²¹⁾ SCHRAMM, *Opponents*, 157.

we would not have satisfactory evidence for a clerical context, but taking the terms together, we are probably dealing with priestly language.

Smith highlights yet another potential difficulty with the identification of the target audience of 65,5 with the priesthood. He states that while he is open to the possibility that priests participated in “syncretistic cults”, “it is most unlikely that the references are only to priests” since 65,1-2 appear to address the whole people⁽²²⁾.

Smith’s critique is justified. The occurrence of the determinations גוי/עם in vv. 1-3 seems to indicate that the whole people, rather than a limited fraction thereof, is accused. I suggest, however, that a solution may be found in the absence of a definite article or a possessive pronoun. The people referred to are called גוי לא־קרא בשמי and עם סורר, i.e. “a nation who does not call upon God’s name”⁽²³⁾ and “a rebellious people”, rather than “the nation” and “the people”. Thus, there is no reason why these persons should constitute the whole nation. Instead, a smaller group of people may be intended, labelled “rebellious people”⁽²⁴⁾. Concerning the case of העם in 65,3, I propose that in the light of the specification by the following plural participles, העם should be understood as “the persons” rather than “the (national) people”. In view of this, there is no reason to reject the identification of the target audience in 65,5 due to the use of the determinations גוי/עם in the preceding vv. 1-3.

3. *Sitz-im-Leben of Isa 65,5*

Having concluded on the one hand that a priestly identity of the person speaking in v. 5 is supported by both content and the clerical vocabulary of his speech, and on the other hand that there is no inherent problem with such an identification in view of 65,3-4, we shall now turn to the matter of the *Sitz-im-Leben* of Isa 65,5. Treating the priest’s saying as a direct quote, addressing a man in second person singular, it is natural to assume that the latter is the author himself. As such, the priest’s language may be considered a taunt at the prophet who claims that only he and his followers are the true servants of God (65,9) and the ones who will inherit His holy mountain (57,13), i.e. the temple. The priest asks him to קרב אליך, indicating that the only place where the author can draw near to is himself rather than to God’s altar. Furthermore, instead of approaching the altar, the prophet is not even allowed to approach the priests (אל־תגשֶׁבִי). Lastly, in response to a hypothetical claim of equal or even surpassing holiness, the priest answers כי קדשתיך, i.e. “I am holier than you”.

4. *The haughtiness of holiness*

The two expressions “אל־תגשֶׁבִי” and “קרב אליך” in 65,5 are often understood in one of two ways.

⁽²²⁾ SMITH, *Rhetoric*, 137.

⁽²³⁾ Repointing the attested inner passive *Qal* קרא to a perfect or an active participle *Paal*. This change is supported by the LXX (οἱ οὐκ ἐκάλεσαν) and by the Vulgate (*quae non invocabat*).

⁽²⁴⁾ Similarly, I suggest that the word גוי in Isa 58,2 refers only to those speaking in 58,3 rather than to the whole people, in contrast to the references to עמי and יעקב in 58,1, which, due to the possessive pronoun and the specific יעקב ביה, refer to the whole nation.

The speaker is warning the people for the latters’ sake: if the people came in contact with something holy, they would bring upon themselves God’s fatal anger (cf. 2 Sam 6,7)⁽²⁵⁾.

The reading in the Vulgate suggests that the speaker expresses concern for *his own* holiness, that is fearing that if a common person touched him, he himself would become polluted⁽²⁶⁾.

There are, however, objections to both interpretations. Concerning the second possibility, there is no textual evidence in the MT that the priests feared contact with others lest they themselves become profaned. The concern is always on the people around them. Even the *Piel* in Ezek 44,19 focuses on the *people*: the priests had to change clothes before leaving the temple for the benefit of the people outside, rather than for their own sake (cf. Ezek 42,14). Num 18,1-7 emphasizes God’s dangerous holiness, speaking about Levitical service: if a Levite touched any of the holy vessels or the altar, both the Levites and the priests would die (v. 3). Further, the Levites alone were allowed to touch the priests. No stranger was allowed in the priests’ presence (v. 4), lest he die (v. 7). Thus, the idea that the priests feared pollution of their own holiness is not likely and we may deem the second interpretation unlikely.

There are also objections to the first possibility. First, the use of short imperatives in “אל־תִּשָּׁבֵי” and “קִרְבֵּי אֱלֹהִים” does not seem to mirror any actual concern for the speakers. Rather, these expressions form brusque reprimands. Furthermore, we would have expected the following קִדְּשִׁיךָ to be a *Piel* form, similarly to Ezek 44,19, to be rendered “because I will make you holy” which might prove fatal. Given that I deemed the revocalization of קִדְּשִׁיךָ to a *Piel* unlikely on both linguistical and textual grounds, it is, however, difficult to accommodate such an exegesis.

Hence, I maintain that the issue is not the contagiousness of holiness. Instead, the solution lies, in my view, in the comparative sense of קִדְּשִׁיךָ. As already alluded to above, I suggest that the whole saying in Isa 65,5 is a direct quote of something a priest said in response to the prophet’s implied claim of equal holiness. Thus, the two expressions “אל־תִּשָּׁבֵי” and “קִרְבֵּי אֱלֹהִים” are yet additional expressions of the priests’ disdain for their opponents and their own sense of superiority and self-righteousness.

*
* *

In this article, I have shown that the person speaking in Isa 65,5 is a priest. I have reached this conclusion by investigating both the grammatical and the contextual aspects of the verse in question. Taken together with its immediate context, 65,5 should therefore be understood as critical towards the Jerusalem clergy. The occurrence of a similar critique, i.e. that of unorthodox worship of YHWH and/ or other deities in 66,3, further supports such an identification.

⁽²⁵⁾ E.g., DELITZSCH, *Jesaja*, 616.

⁽²⁶⁾ E.g., J. MUILENBURG, *The Book of Isaiah. Chapters 40–66* (IB 5; Nashville 1956) 748, who argues that the speakers have become holy as a result of the rites described in vv. 3–4, and fear that contact with others would render them profane.

I suggest that the expression קדשתיך should be understood as a *Qal*, taking a direct object indicating comparison. Hence, the speaker in 65,5 expresses his belief that he is “holier than you”, i.e. holier than the prophet whom he is addressing. Such an understanding of the verb קדשתיך is supported by several of the ancient versions and by similar syntactical constructions in Biblical Hebrew. Accepting the priestly vocabulary in the longer קדשתיך כי קרב אליך אל-תגשבי in v. 5a, together with my claim that this uttering fits best to a clerical person, I conclude that Isa 65,5 criticizes the priesthood.

University of Birmingham
Department of Theology
Birmingham B15 2TT

Lena-Sofia TIEMEYER

SUMMARY

The expression קדשתיך כי קרב אליך אל-תגשבי (Isa 65,5), is best understood as uttered by one of the priests in Jerusalem. Both the ancient translations as well as contemporary insight in Hebrew grammar support the translation of קדשתיך as “I am holier than you”. This indicates that the speaker in v. 5 regards himself as holier than his immediate surroundings. As such, it indicates a priestly identity. The interpretation of the two expressions “אל-תגשבי” and “קרב אליך” support this conclusion: their content express the speaker’s disdain for his opponents and his own sense of self-righteousness. Further, their priestly vocabulary suggests a clerical speaker. Such an understanding complements the claim made by several scholars (e.g., P. Hanson, A. Rofé) that the author of Isa 66,3 held a critical disposition towards the priesthood.

Death Formulae and the Burial Place of the Kings of the House of David

1. Death Formulae of the Late Kings of Judah

The closing formulae about the death of a king describe his demise and burial place, followed by the name of his successor — but only when the king died peacefully in his bed. When the king was murdered, or otherwise died a violent death, or was deported and died in exile, the ‘slept with his ancestors’ formula is left out. The basic death formula for the kings of Judah, from David to Ahaz, is ‘and so-and-so slept with his ancestors and was buried with his ancestors in the city of David; and so-and-so his son reigned in his stead’. The formulae for the three kings who were killed in uprisings (Ahaziah, Joash and Amaziah) are identical, except for the element of peaceful death⁽¹⁾.

The death formula changes in the histories of the kings from Hezekiah onward. The words ‘(was buried) with his ancestors in the city of David’ disappear. A striking omission of the burial place appears in the case of Hezekiah (2 Kgs 20,21): ‘And Hezekiah slept with his ancestors, and Manasseh his son reigned in his stead’⁽²⁾. Manasseh was buried ‘in the garden of his house, in the garden of Uzza’ (2 Kgs 22,18); his son, Amon, was buried ‘in his tomb in the garden of Uzza’ (2 Kgs 22,26). The burial place of Josiah is not mentioned, and it is only stated that his servants ‘buried him in his tomb’ (2 Kgs 23,30). Jehoahaz, Jehoiachin and Zedekiah who were deported, died and were buried in exile, have no death formula, whereas Jehoiakim has the formula of a king who died peacefully in his bed, but his burial place is missing (2 Kgs 24,6). The LXX¹ version adds, ‘he was buried in the garden of Uzza with his ancestors’. Some scholars have suggested that the supplement is original and was omitted due to *homoioteleuton*⁽³⁾, while

(¹) For the closing formulae in the Book of Kings, see A. JEPSEN, *Die Quellen des Königsbuches* (Halle 1956) 30-40; S.R. BIN-NUN, “Formulas from Royal Records of Israel and Judah”, *VT* 18 (1968) 429-432; R.D. NELSON, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History* (JSOTSS 18; Sheffield 1981) 29-41; I.W. PROVAN, *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings. A Contribution to the Debate about the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* (BZAW 172; Berlin – New York 1988) 134-138; B. HALPERN – D.S. VANDERHOOF, “The Editions of Kings in the 7th–6th Centuries B.C.E.”, *HUCA* 62 (1991) 183-199; K.A.D. SMELIK – H.J. VAN SOEST, “Overlijdensteksten in het boek Koningen”, *ACEBT* 13 (1994) 56-71; E. EYNIKEL, *The Reform of King Josiah and the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* (OTS 33; Leiden 1996) 129-135.

(²) 2 Chr 32,33 relates that Hezekiah was buried ‘in the ascent of the tombs of the sons of David’. It is unlikely that the Chronicler had a different version of the Book of Kings than the one we have. Rather he was trying to fill in the gap that he found in his source. The description of Hezekiah’s burial in the upper part of the tombs of his predecessors and the honour that all Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem showed him at his death – both signs of exceptional distinction – was composed by the Chronicler in keeping with his very high valuation of Hezekiah. See E.L. CURTIS, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles* (ICC; Edinburgh 1910) 493-494; W. RUDOLPH, *Chronikbücher* (HAT 1/21; Tübingen 1955) 313-314; H.G.M. WILLIAMSON, *1 and 2 Chronicles* (NCBC; Grand Rapids – London 1982) 388; S. JAPHET, *1 & II Chronicles. A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville 1993) 997-998.

(³) O. THENIUS, *Die Bücher der Könige* (KEH 9; Leipzig 1873) 461-462; I. BENZINGER, *Die Bücher der Könige erklärt* (KHC IX; Freiburg 1899) 197; A. SANDA, *Die*

others argue that the LXX^L version (and the LXX to 2 Chr 36,8) is secondary and was added to avoid clashing with Jer 22,19 and 36,30⁽⁴⁾. As noted, the formula '(was buried) with his ancestors' disappears after the reign of Ahaz, so its proposed sudden re-appearance in the closing formula of Jehoiakim is unlikely. Moreover, Jehoiakim died during the siege of Jerusalem and could not have been buried in the garden of Uzza, outside the city's wall (see below)⁽⁵⁾. Thus the LXX^L version is apparently a late addition to the text.

Provan and Halpern – Vanderhooft deduced from some changes in the introductory and closing formulae of Hezekiah and his successors that the first edition of the Book of Kings ended with the reign of Hezekiah⁽⁶⁾. However, these changes may easily be explained as the result of the short time-span that separates the events from the time when they were recorded. The author of the Book of Kings (Dtr₁) wrote his composition in the time of Josiah, and his successor (Dtr₂) edited and supplemented his composition in Babylonia⁽⁷⁾. These authors worked soon after the events they described and were not dependent on written sources. For this reason they were able to supply details (i.e., birthplace and father's name) about the mothers of all the kings from Amon to Zedekiah. For the earlier kings, the author (Dtr₁) depended on his written sources and his work related the information he was able to extract. Therefore details about the kings' mothers are given unsystematically. This author also had only general knowledge about the burial place of most of the kings of Judah, and related it with the fixed formula 'was buried with his ancestors in the city of David'. With the transfer of the burial place to a new site (the garden of Uzza), he omitted the death formula, which no longer fitted anymore the new rulers, who were neither buried with their ancestors nor in the City of David. Thus the omission of the death formula from Hezekiah on reflects the fact of a burial in a new site, and should not be taken as evidence of new authorship. We may conclude that

Bücher der Könige übersetzt und erklärt (EHAT IX; Münster 1912) II, 367-368; NELSON, *Double Redaction*, 86; E. WÜRTHWEIN, *Die Bücher der Könige. 1 Kön 17 – 2 Kön 25* (ATD 11,2; Göttingen 1984) 469.

⁽⁴⁾ J.A. MONTGOMERY, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings* (ICC; Edinburgh 1951) 553; C.R. SEITZ, *Theology in Conflict. Redactions to the Exile in the Book of Jeremiah* (New York 1989) 106; see M. REHM, *Das zweite Buch der Könige. Ein Kommentar* (Würzburg 1982) 236; M. COGAN – H. TADMOR, *II Kings. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 11; Garden City, NY 1988) 307.

⁽⁵⁾ MONTGOMERY, *Books of Kings*, 553; see WÜRTHWEIN, *Bücher der Könige*, 469.

⁽⁶⁾ PROVAN, *Hezekiah*, 134-143; HALPERN – VANDERHOOF, "Editions of Kings", 179-199.

⁽⁷⁾ I follow the so-called 'block model' first suggested by F.M. Cross and supported by other scholars. For detailed discussion, see F.M. CROSS, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic. Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge 1973) 274-289; NELSON, *Double Redaction*; R.E. FRIEDMAN, *The Exile and Biblical Narrative. The Formation of the Deuteronomistic and Priestly Works* (Chico 1981); A.D.H. MAYES, *The Story of Israel between Settlement and Exile. A Redactional Study of the Deuteronomistic History* (London 1983); COGAN – TADMOR, *II Kings*; S.L. MCKENZIE, *The Trouble with Kings. The Composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History* (Leiden 1991); G.N. KNOPPERS, *Two Nations Under God. The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies I-II* (Atlanta 1993-1994); N. NA'AMAN, *The Past that Shapes the Present. The Creation of Biblical Historiography in the Late First Temple Period and After the Downfall* (Yeriot; Jerusalem 2002) 43-77 (Hebrew).

the opening and closing formulae of the kings of Judah should be explained on the basis of the written sources available to the authors and their acquaintance with the realities of the late monarchical period, and in no way indicate an early edition of the Book of Kings⁽⁸⁾.

This leaves us still with the problem of the omission of the burial place of Hezekiah — a problem which, as suggested below, might be resolved by taking into account the objectives of the author of the Book of Kings.

2. The Burial Place of the Kings of Judah

The site of the tombs of the kings of Judah is controversial. Some scholars suggested that it was located in the southeastern side of the City of David, where Weill discovered some installations hewn out of the rock, which were severely destroyed by Roman quarrying operations⁽⁹⁾. Krauss suggested that some Judahite kings were buried beneath the temple⁽¹⁰⁾; Yeivin searched the tombs within the city walls, east of the spring of Gihon⁽¹¹⁾; Kloner suggested that some late Judahite kings were buried at St. Etienne, north of the City of David⁽¹²⁾; other scholars were reluctant to suggest an exact location⁽¹³⁾. I agree with the opinion that the unimpressive

(8) For the hypothesis of three successive editions of the Book of Kings, see H. WEIPPERT, "Die 'deuteronomistischen' Beurteilungen der Könige von Israel und Juda und das Problem der Redaktion der Königsbücher", *Biblica* 53 (1972) 301-339; A. LEMAIRE, "Vers l'histoire de la rédaction des Livres des Rois", *ZAW* 98 (1986) 221-236; HALPERN – VANDERHOOF, "Editions of Kings", 179-244; EYNIKEL, *Reform of King Josiah*; ID., "The Portrait of Manasseh and the Deuteronomistic History", *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic Literature*. Festschrift C.H.W. Brekelmans (eds. M. VERVENNE – J. LUST) (BETL 133; Leuven 1997) 233-261. For an assumed early edition of the time of Hezekiah and a second exilic edition, see H.N. RÖSEL, *Von Josua bis Jojachin*. Untersuchungen zu den deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbüchern des Alten Testaments (SVT 75; Leiden 1999).

(9) R. WEILL, *La cité de David. Compte rendu du fouilles exécutées à Jérusalem, sur la site de la ville primitive, campagne de 1913-1914* (Paris 1920) 35-44, 157-173; L.-H. VINCENT, "Mélanges. II: La cité de David d'après les fouilles de 1913-1914", *RB* 30 (1921) 411-423; L.-H. VINCENT – A.-M. STEVE, *Jérusalem de l'Ancien Testament*. Recherches d'archéologie et d'histoire (Paris 1954) I, 312-323; K. GALLING, "Die Nekropole von Jerusalem", *PJ* 32 (1936) 95; ID., "Grab", *Biblische Reallexikon* (Tübingen 1937) 244-247; J.J. SIMONS, *Jerusalem in the Old Testament* (Leiden 1952) 198-221; J. JEREMIAS, *Heiligengräber in Jesu Umwelt* (Mt. 23,29; Lk. 11,47). Eine Untersuchung zur Volksreligion der Zeit Jesu (Göttingen 1958) 56-60. Some scholars suggested identifying the tomb of Hezekiah, which according to the Book of Chronicles (32,33) was buried 'in the ascent of the tombs of the sons of David', with a tomb discovered by Weill in the 1923/24 season and located south of the other installations. See R. WEILL, "La 'Pointe sud' de la Cité de David et les fouilles de 1923-1924", *REJ* 82 (1926) 110-113; VINCENT – STEVE, *Jérusalem*, 322; JEREMIAS, *Heiligengräber*, 60-61.

(10) S. KRAUSS, "Moriah-Ariel. 5. The Sepulchres of the Davidic Dynasty", *PEQ* 79 (1947) 102-111;

(11) S. YEIVIN, "The Sepulchres of the Kings of the House of David", *JNES* 7 (1948) 30-45.

(12) A. KLONER, "The 'Third Wall' in Jerusalem and the 'Cave of the Kings' (Josephus War V 147)", *Levant* 18 (1986) 121-129.

(13) K.M. KENYON, *Digging up Jerusalem* (London 1974) 31-32, 47, 156-157; G. BARKAY, "On the Location of the Tombs of the later Kings of the House of David", between *Hermion and Sinai: Memorial to Amnon*. Studies in History, Archaeology and Geography of Eretz Israel (ed. M. BROSHI) (Jerusalem 1977) 75-92 (Hebrew); ID., "The Necropolis of Jerusalem in the First Temple Period", *The History of Jerusalem. The*

plan and lack of refinement in the execution of the installations discovered by Weill, compared to the quality of the tombs discovered at the Silwan necropolis of Jerusalem⁽¹⁴⁾ indicate that they should not be identified as the royal tombs of the kings of Judah⁽¹⁵⁾.

To shed more light on the possible location of the royal tombs we must turn our attention to neighbouring ancient Near Eastern kingdoms. Recently Franklin drew attention to two neglected hewn tombs excavated by the Harvard Expedition at Samaria⁽¹⁶⁾. They are located under adjoining palace rooms of Building Period I, and were cut at different phases of the early palace. She suggested that Tomb A was prepared for Omri and Tomb B for Ahab or one of his heirs.

Six underground vaulted chambers were discovered in the excavations of the southeast side of the Old Palace at the city of Assur⁽¹⁷⁾. Sarcophagi made of basalt or limestone were found in these chambers, identified by inscriptions as those of Ashur-bel-kala (1074-1057 BCE), Ashurnasirpal (883-859) and Shamshi-Adad V (823-810). Sennacherib too was buried at Assur, as indicated by two inscriptions on bricks discovered in the city⁽¹⁸⁾. Weidner demonstrated that when Ashurbanipal was the crown prince, he built a mausoleum (*bīt kimahḫi*) for his burial in the city of Assur⁽¹⁹⁾. Eshar-ḫamat, Esarhaddon's wife, was also buried in Assur, possibly in the same compound as the kings of Assyria⁽²⁰⁾. Finally, in the so-called 'the Sin of Sargon' text, Sennacherib inquired the gods why his father, Sargon, 'was killed [in the enemy country and] was not b[uried] in his house'⁽²¹⁾. It is thus evident that the kings of Assyria were buried in their 'house', probably in the city of Assur, the ancient capital of Assyria.

Four vaulted royal tombs have been discovered within the confines of the Northwest Palace at Calah. The inscriptions indicate that they were the tombs of the queens of Assyria, who were buried together with other members of

Biblical Period (eds. S. AHITUV – A. MAZAR) (Jerusalem 2000) 234-237 (Hebrew); V.A. HUROWITZ, "Burial in the Bible", *Beit Mikra* 161 (2000) 134-137 (Hebrew).

⁽¹⁴⁾ For the tombs discovered at Silwan, see D. USSISHKIN, *The Village of Silwan. The Necropolis from the Period of the Judahite Kingdom* (Jerusalem 1993).

⁽¹⁵⁾ BARKAY, "Location of the Tombs", 75-77; idem, "Necropolis of Jerusalem", 234-237. Kenyon (*Digging up Jerusalem*, 31-32, 47, 156-157) also dismissed Weill's identification of the installations as royal tombs. Since remains of plaster were detected therein she suggested that originally they were cisterns.

⁽¹⁶⁾ N. FRANKLIN, "The Tombs of the Kings of Israel. Two Recently Identified 9th-Century Tombs from Omride Samaria", *ZDPV* 119 (2003) 1-11.

⁽¹⁷⁾ W. ANDRAE, *Das wiedererstandene Assur* (Leipzig 1938) 136-140; A. HALLER, *Die Gräber und Gräfte von Assur* (WVDOG 65; Berlin 1954) 170-181; The complex of underground vaulted chambers was probably called *bīt šarrāni ma'dūti* ('House of many Kings') in a distribution text from Assur. See E. EBELING, *Stiftungen und Vorschriften für assyrische Tempel* (Berlin 1954) 18-20.

⁽¹⁸⁾ D.D. LUCKENBILL, *The Annals of Sennacherib* (OIP II; Chicago 1924) 151, Nos. XIII-XIV.

⁽¹⁹⁾ E.F. WEIDNER, "Assurbânipal in Assur", *AfO* 13 (1939-1941) 213-216.

⁽²⁰⁾ EBELING, *Stiftungen*, 18-20. For the rites at the death of Assyrian kings, see J. MCGINNIS, "A Neo-Assyrian Text Describing a Royal Funeral", *State Archives of Assyria Bulletin* 1 (1987) 1-11.

⁽²¹⁾ H. TADMOR – B. LANDSBERGER – S. PARPOLA, "The Sin of Sargon and Sennacherib's Last Will", *State Archives of Assyria Bulletin* 3 (1989) 10-11, lines 19-20.

the royal court⁽²²⁾. The kings of the Third Dynasty of Ur (late third-early second millennium BCE) were probably buried in their residential palace, and the 'Mausolea' excavated by Woolley was probably a cult place for the dead kings⁽²³⁾. A corbel-vaulted royal tomb was discovered under the palace of Ras Shamra/Ugarit⁽²⁴⁾. Adler suggested that the 14th Century 'Schatzhaus' unearthed at Kamid el-Loz (Kumidi) was originally a royal grave and that other second millennium royal tombs located in or near the palace were discovered at Alalakh, Tel Mardikh (Ebla), Byblos and Megiddo (Stratum VIIA)⁽²⁵⁾. Other suggested evidence for royal burials in palace remains uncertain⁽²⁶⁾.

Descriptions of the death of kings are found sporadically in cuneiform documents⁽²⁷⁾, but the place of burial is never mentioned. An exception is a Babylonian chronicle (called "the Dynastic Chronicle") that records the burial place of six Babylonian kings of the late eleventh-early tenth century BCE⁽²⁸⁾. Five of them were buried in the palaces of Sargon⁽²⁹⁾, or Kār-Marduk; the sixth was buried in the swamp of Bit-Hashmar, near his homeland, possibly an unworthy burial place for a king.

The above makes it clear that the practice of burying kings in their 'houses', namely their palaces, conceived as places of dwelling and rest in life and after-life, was widespread all over the ancient Near East⁽³⁰⁾. This supports the assumption that the kings of the House of David were also buried in the royal palace. As noted above, the later kings of Judah were buried in a new place (the garden of Uzza), whose location must be clarified.

According to Neh 3,15-16, the segment of the city wall that included the Fountain Gate and 'the wall of the Pool of Shelah of the King's Garden' was

⁽²²⁾ M.S.B. DAMERJI, "Gräber Assyrischer Königinnen aus Nimrud", *Jahrbuch des Römischen-Germanischen Zentralmuseums* 45 (1998) 19-84.

⁽²³⁾ P.R.S. MOOREY, "Where did They Bury the Kings of the IIIrd Dynasty of Ur?", *Iraq* 46 (1984) 1-18.

⁽²⁴⁾ F.A. SCHAFFER, "Reprise des recherches archéologiques à Ras Shamra-Ugarit. Sondages de 1948 et 1949 et campagne de 1950", *Syria* 28 (1951) 14-17; MOOREY, "IIIrd Dynasty of Ur", 16.

⁽²⁵⁾ W. ADLER, *Kāmid el-Lōz, 11. Das 'Schatzhaus' im Palastbereich. Die Befunde des Königsgrabes* (Saarbrücker Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 47; Bonn 1994) 126-148; see R. HACHMANN (ed.), *Kāmid el-Lōz, 16. 'Schatzhaus'-Studien* (Saarbrücker Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 59; Bonn 1996) 208-264.

⁽²⁶⁾ MOOREY, "IIIrd Dynasty of Ur", 15-16; see Y.M. AL-KHALESI, "The *bīt kispim* in Mesopotamian Architecture: Studies of Form and Function", *Mesopotamia* 12 (1977) 59-81.

⁽²⁷⁾ For a detailed treatment, see W.W. HALLO, "The Death of Kings: Traditional Historiography in Contextual Perspective", *Ah, Assyria ... Studies in Assyrian History and Ancient Near Eastern Historiography Presented to Hayim Tadmor* (eds. M. COGAN - I. EPH'AL) (Jerusalem 1991) 157-159.

⁽²⁸⁾ A.K. GRAYSON, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* (Locust Valley 1975) 41-42, 142-143.

⁽²⁹⁾ Whether the custom of burying kings in the palace already existed in Akkad under Sargon's dynasty, as might be inferred from this reference, remains uncertain. See P. MICHALOWSKI, "The Death of Šulgi", *Orientalia* 46 (1977) 220 n. 3; MOOREY, "IIIrd Dynasty of Ur", 15.

⁽³⁰⁾ M. NOVÁK, "Das 'Haus der Totenpflege'. Zur Sepulkralsymbolik des Hauses im Alten Mesopotamien", *Altorientalische Forschungen* 27 (2000) 132-154. Novák suggested that the concept of the house as dwelling and resting place for its inhabitants explains the imitation of palaces in burial places erected on cliffs and in the plain.

next to the segment that stood 'opposite the tombs of David'. The Fountain Gate and the King's Pool also appear in the description of the tour conducted by Nehemiah around the destroyed city wall of Jerusalem (Neh 2,14-15). All scholars agree that the two segments of the rebuilt wall mentioned in Neh 3,15-16 were located near the southeastern end of the city⁽³¹⁾.

The King's Garden is mentioned in 2 Kgs 25,4 and Jer 52,7. Weill suggested that it was located on the slopes of the Kidron Valley in the southeast end of the City of David, and was irrigated by Canal II, and later by Canal IV⁽³²⁾. In his discussion of the Siloam Tunnel, Ussishkin suggested that Hezekiah, in imitation to the kings of Assyria, planted a royal park near the walls of the City of David, and that the water of the Siloam tunnel were used to irrigate the garden situated outside the city, near the southeast of the City of David⁽³³⁾. The garden of Uzza, which in 2 Kgs 21,18 is called 'the garden of his house', is clearly the King's Garden mentioned in 2 Kgs 25,4; Jer 52,7 and Neh 3,15. Hence the reference in Neh 3,16 to the tombs of David refers to the tombs of the late kings of Judah who were buried in the garden of Uzza⁽³⁴⁾. Like other ancient Near Eastern kings, the kings of Judah built more than one palace, and I assume that a royal residence was built near the newly planted royal park (see Jer 22,13-14)⁽³⁵⁾. Manasseh's 'garden of his house' probably refers to this residence (compare 1 Kgs 21,1-2).

⁽³¹⁾ M. AVI-YONAH, "The Walls of Nehemiah – A Minimalist View", *IEJ* 4 (1954) 239-248 (esp. 240); JEREMIAS, *Heiligengräber*, 56; H.G.M. WILLIAMSON, "Nehemiah's Wall Revisited", *PEQ* 116 (1984) 81-88; H. ESHEL, "Jerusalem under Persian Rule: The City's Layout and the Historical Background", *The History of Jerusalem: The Biblical Period* (eds. S. AHITUV – A. MAZAR) (Jerusalem 2000) 333-341 (esp. 334) (Hebrew).

⁽³²⁾ WEILL, "La Pointe sud", 113-117; ID., *La cité de David. Campagne de 1923-1924* (Paris 1947) 57-73. WEILL ("La Pointe sud", 117) concluded his early discussion as follows: "Au-dessous de la vieille courtine J 1, dans le Cédron qui s'élargit et se creuse, l'eau trouve elle de vastes pentes où l'irrigation entretient un verger magnifique: les *Jardins du roi* fleurissent toujours, du haut en bas de ce flanc de vallée". See also Y. SHILOH, *Excavations at the City of David* (Qedem 19; Jerusalem 1984) 23.

⁽³³⁾ D. USSISHKIN, "The Water Systems of Jerusalem during Hezekiah's Reign", *Meilenstein. Festgabe für Herbert Donner* (eds. M. GÖRG – M. WEIPPERT) (ÄAT 30; Wiesbaden 1995) 300-303. For criticism of Ussishkin's suggestion that the Siloam tunnel was hewn mainly for the watering of the royal park, see A. MAZAR, "Was Hezekiah's Tunnel Dug in Vain", *Cathedra* 78 (1995) 187-188 (Hebrew); ID., "Jerusalem's Water Supply in the First Temple Period", *The History of Jerusalem* (AHITUV – MAZAR) 221-224 (Hebrew).

⁽³⁴⁾ Weill (*La cité de David*, 35-44) argued that the burials after the reign of Ahaz were outside the walls of Jerusalem. Provan (*Hezekiah*, 136 and n. 12) criticized his suggestion, arguing that Manasseh's palace, and therefore the garden of Uzza (2 Kgs 21,18), were within the walls of Jerusalem. He ignored the explicit reference to the king's garden and the tombs of David in Neh 3,15-16, and did not consider the possibility that the kings of Judah could have had more than one residence. Moreover, Provan (*Hezekiah*, 134-138) apparently assumed that our sources supply detailed information of the building operations of the kings of Judah, and dismissed all suggestions that are not based on evidence explicitly mentioned in the Bible. It must be emphasized that we know very little about the building projects carried out by the kings of Judah, and it is entirely legitimate to make assumptions on the basis of the archaeological research of Jerusalem and ancient Near Eastern documents.

⁽³⁵⁾ An example of a garden located near the palace appears on Ashurbanipal's garden party relief. See P. ALBENDA, "Grapevines in Ashurbanipal's Garden", *BASOR* 215 (1974) 5-17; R.D. BARNETT, "Assurbanipal's Feast", *Eretz Israel* 18 (1985) 1*-6*; K.-H. DELLER, "Assurbanipal in der Gartenlaube", *Baghm* 18 (1987) 229-238; I. ZIFFER, "What Happened under the Grapevine? New Insights into Ashurbanipal's Garden Party Relief", *Eretz Israel* 27 (2003) 204-211, with earlier literature (Hebrew).

The location of the garden outside the walls of Jerusalem explains the different formulae referring to the kings who preceded Hezekiah, all of whom were buried 'in the city of David', and the kings of Judah from Hezekiah on, in whose death formulae the City of David is not mentioned⁽³⁶⁾.

Ezekiel's words (43,7-9) on the proximity of the burial places of the kings of Judah to the temple play an important role in some scholarly discussions⁽³⁷⁾. Due to its importance, the text is cited in full (in the New JPS translation):

It said to me, 'O mortal, this is the place of My throne and the place for the soles of My feet, where I will dwell in the midst of the people Israel forever. The House of Israel and their kings must not again defile My holy name by their apostasy and by the corpses of their kings at their death⁽³⁸⁾. When they placed their threshold next to My threshold and their doorposts next to My doorposts with only a wall between Me and them, they would defile My holy name by the abominations that they committed, and I consumed them in My anger. Therefore, let them put their apostasy and the corpses of their kings far from Me, and I will dwell among them forever.'

Ezekiel was born to a priestly family and his words indicate that priests who served in the temple criticized the proximity of the palace, the seat of the kings of Judah and their burial place, to the temple, with only 'a wall' separating them (see 1 Kgs 14,27-28; 2 Kgs 11,19). The motives for the criticism were apparently the lifestyle of the inhabitants of the palace, impurity involved with the burial of the royal dynasty in the palace, and the rites conducted for the spirits of the deceased⁽³⁹⁾. The purity laws formulated

⁽³⁶⁾ This was correctly noted by Weill (*La cité de David*, 35-44).

⁽³⁷⁾ See for example: G. RICHTER, "Der salomonische Königspalast: Eine exegetische Studie", *ZDPV* 40 (1917) 206, 224; WEILL, *La cité de David*, 35-40; G.A. COOKE, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel* (ICC; Edinburgh 1936) 464-465; KRAUSS, "Sepulchres", 106-111; VINCENT – STEVE, *Jérusalem*, 315; JEREMIAS, *Heiligengräber*, 53-56; J. GRAY, *I & II Kings*. A Commentary (OTL; Philadelphia 1970) 710; HUROWITZ, "Burial in the Bible", 136; W. ZIMMERLI, *Ezekiel 2. A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel Chapters 25-48* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia 1983) 417-418.

⁽³⁸⁾ For a detailed discussion of v. 7b, see D. BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle de l'ancien Testament* (OBO 50; Fribourg – Göttingen 1992) III, 378-380. Barthélemy translated 'et par les cadavres de leurs rois, c'est-à-dire leurs monuments funéraires'. However, the assumed interpretation of *bāmôt* as 'funerary monuments' was dismissed long ago by scholars and cannot be upheld any more. See P.V. VAUGHAN, *The Meaning of 'bāmâ' in the Old Testament. A Study of Etymological, Textual, and Archaeological Evidence* (Cambridge 1974); W.B. BARRICK, "The Funerary Character of 'High Places' in Ancient Palestine: A Reassessment", *VT* 25 (1975) 565-595; M.D. FOWLER, "The Israelite *bāmâ*: A Question of Interpretation", *ZAW* 94 (1982) 203-213. Zimmerli's translation of *pgr* as 'memorial' (*Ezekiel* 2, 409) is also not supported by evidence. See VAUGHAN, *Meaning of 'bāmâ'*, 64-65, n. 73.

⁽³⁹⁾ For the cult of the ancestors in the ancient Near East, see A. TSUKIMOTO, *Untersuchungen zur Totenpflege (kispum) im alten Mesopotamien* (AOAT 216; Kevelaer – Neukirchen-Vluyn 1985); K. SPRONK, *Beatific Afterlife in Ancient Israel and in the Ancient Near East* (AOAT 219; Kevelaer – Neukirchen-Vluyn 1986); Th.J. LEWIS, *Cults of the Dead in Ancient Israel and Ugarit* (HSM 39; Atlanta 1989); W.W. HALLO, "Royal Ancestors Worship in the Biblical World", *"Sha'arei Talmon"*. Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon (eds. M. FISHBANE –

in the Bible (e.g., Num 19,14-19) are late and irrelevant for the discussion, but Ezekiel's words reflect a late First Temple priestly opposition to the practice of burial within the palace.

It is worth noting that all the 130 tombs excavated so far in Jerusalem and dated to the eighth to early sixth centuries BCE are located outside the city, and their distribution matches exactly the outer confines of its walls⁽⁴⁰⁾. The location of the tombs outside the city is due to the search for a suitable place for hewing or excavating tombs, but might also have been motivated by a sense of the impurity attached to graves. Be that as it may, the burial of the royal tombs within the city was exceptional.

Jeremias suggested that Ezekiel's words refer to the garden of Uzza, where Manasseh and Amon were buried, and that the garden must be sought in the royal acropolis, between the palace and the temple⁽⁴¹⁾. He suggested locating the tombs of the earlier kings of Judah in the southeastern part of the City of David, at the site where Weill found the hewn installations mentioned above. In my opinion, the exact opposite is true. Until the time of Hezekiah the kings of the House of David were buried in the palace, or near it, in accordance with the practice common to many ancient Near Eastern kingdoms. Under Hezekiah the burial place was transferred to a new site outside the walls of Jerusalem, and he was the first to be buried there. Yet the tombs of the early kings of Judah remained in the palace, and Ezekiel's words echo the criticism of the priests of the impurity that 'the corpses of their kings' brought into YHWH's temple.

The omission of the burial place in the case of Hezekiah (2 Kgs 20,21) can now be satisfactorily explained. The death formula of the early Judahite kings ('and so-and-so slept with his ancestors and was buried with his ancestors in the city of David'), which combined the continuity of the dynasty with the burial place, did not fit the burial in a new site. Hezekiah is portrayed favourably in the Book of Kings, with such a superlative as 'there was none like him among all the kings of Judah after him, nor among those before him' (2 Kgs 18,5). Presenting him as a king who was not buried with his ancestors might have spoiled this positive description. For this reason the author cut short his burial formula and ascribed the transfer of the burial place to a new site (the garden of Uzza) to Manasseh, the arch-sinner among all the kings of Judah.

The location of the new burial place outside the walls of Jerusalem also explains the absence of a burial formula in the description of Jehoiakim. This ruler died during the Babylonian siege of Jerusalem and could not have been buried with his ancestors outside the walls of Jerusalem. He must have been

E. Tov) (Winona Lake 1992) 381-401, with earlier literature; H. NIEHR, "Zum Totenkult der Könige von Sam'al im 9. und 8. Jh. V. Chr.", *Studi Epigrafici e Linguistici sul Vicino Oriente Antico* 11 (1994) 57-73.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ G. BARKAY, *Northern and Western Jerusalem at the End of the Iron Age* (Ph.D. Dissertation; Tel Aviv University 1985) (Hebrew); ID., "Necropolis of Jerusalem", 233-270, with earlier literature. For a comprehensive picture of the burial caves discovered so far in the Kingdom of Judah, see I. YEZERSKI, "Burial-Cave Distribution and the Borders of the Kingdom of Judah toward the End of the Iron Age", *Tel Aviv* 26 (1999) 253-270, with earlier literature.

⁽⁴¹⁾ JEREMIAS, *Heiligengräber*, 53-56.

buried somewhere within the city⁽⁴²⁾. The LXX^L version of 2 Kgs 24,6 emerged at a later stage of the transmission in an effort to harmonize the text of Kings with Jeremiah's prophecies (22,19; 36,30. The author of the final chapters of the Book of Kings (Dtr₂), who lived in the Babylonian exile, was probably aware of the fact that Jehoiakim was not buried with his ancestors in the garden of Uzza, and in view of the obscurity that might have surrounded his burial decided to omit the burial place from the king's death formula⁽⁴³⁾.

*
* *

In sum, I restate my conclusions that the kings of Judah in the tenth-eighth centuries BCE were buried in the palace, and that Hezekiah transferred the burial place of the kings of Judah to a new site outside the walls of Jerusalem. I further suggest that burial within the city walls was exceptional, and that the admonitions and possible pressure of the temple priests, who felt that the burial in the palace defiled the adjacent temple, might have influenced Hezekiah's decision. Provided that this conclusion, admittedly uncertain, is acceptable, it sheds a new light on the religious policy of Hezekiah. According to the Book of Kings, he initiated a cultic reform, similar to the one conducted later by Josiah (2 Kgs 18,4.22). I have already discussed the assumed far-reaching reform conducted by Hezekiah, and concluded that the two references to Hezekiah's implementation of the reform are deuteronomistic, that the attribution of a Josianic-like reform to Hezekiah is doubtful, and that the note on the removal of the bronze serpent is the authentic element in the text of 2 Kgs 18,4⁽⁴⁴⁾. Hezekiah's assumed removal of the royal burial place out of the city matches the removal of the bronze serpent from the temple, probably also at the instigation of the same priestly circles. It also fits Hezekiah's portrayal as a king who put his trust in YHWH in face of the Assyrian campaign and the grave threat to the survival of his kingdom and capital city in 2 Kgs 18–19⁽⁴⁵⁾. The assumed growth of the

⁽⁴²⁾ MONTGOMERY, *Books of Kings*, 553. Würthwein (*Bücher der Könige*, 469) also noted that — whether the Lucianic version of 2 Kgs 24,6 is original, or was written in an effort to accommodate the text to Jeremiah's prophecies — historically the LXX^L version is erroneous since Jehoiakim could not have been buried in the garden of Uzza, outside the walls of Jerusalem.

⁽⁴³⁾ It is not clear whether or not the author knew the details concerning Jehoiakim's burial. For discussion, see GRAY, *I & II Kings*, 753–754; SEITZ, *Theology in Conflict*, 116–119.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ N. NA'AMAN, "The Debated Historicity of Hezekiah's Reform in the Light of Historical and Archaeological Research", *ZAW* 107 (1995) 179–195.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ A parallel to the assumed growing influence of the priests on certain Judahite kings may be found in Assyria in the time of Esarhaddon (680–669) and Assurbanipal (668–631). See B. LANDSBERGER, *Brief des Bischofs von Esagila an König Esarhaddon* (MNAW.L 28/6; Amsterdam 1965); S. PARPOLA, *Letters from Assyrian Scholars to the Kings Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal*. Part I: *Texts* (AOAT 5/1; Kevelaer – Neukirchen-Vluyn 1970); ID., *Letters from Assyrian Scholars to the Kings Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal*. Part II: *Commentary and Appendices* (AOAT 5/2; Kevelaer – Neukirchen-Vluyn 1983); ID., *Letters from Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars* (State Archives of Assyria X; Helsinki 1993); ID., *Assyrian Prophecies* (State Archives of Assyria IX; Helsinki 1997); M. NISSINEN, *References to Prophecy in Neo-Assyrian Sources* (State Archives of Assyria Studies VII; Helsinki 1998); S.W. COLE – P. MACHINIST, *Letters from Priests to the Kings Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal* (State Archives of Assyria XIII; Helsinki 1998).

priestly influence could also have brought about the gradual shaping of their teaching, although it was carried out for a long time in oral form, and put in writing only in the exilic period. But the investigation of this problem goes far beyond the narrow limits of this article.

Department of Jewish History
Tel Aviv University
Ramat Aviv
69978 Israel

Nadav NA'AMAN

SUMMARY

The article re-examines the death formulae of the kings of Judah, in particular those of the kings from Hezekiah onward. It is suggested the kings of Judah in the tenth-eighth centuries BCE were buried in the palace, and that Hezekiah transferred the burial place of the kings of Judah to a new site (the garden of Uzza) outside the walls of Jerusalem. Hezekiah's decision to transfer the burial place might have been influenced by the admonitions and possible pressure of the temple priests, who felt that the burial in the palace defiled the adjacent temple (see Ezek 43,7-9). The change in the closing formulae of the late kings of Judah should be explained on the basis of the reality of the late monarchical period and the objectives of the authors of the Book of Kings, and in no way indicates an early edition of the Book of Kings as some scholars suggest.

La instauración del Trono en siete septenarios La macronarrativa y su estructura en el Apocalipsis de Juan

Al consultar las ediciones más recientes de comentarios e introducciones al Apocalipsis de Juan observamos que los exegetas modernos han definido claramente algunas características de su estructura. La gran mayoría nota un giro narrativo importante en 12,1 y divide al libro en dos secciones principales dentro de las cuales señalan con facilidad las etapas de las siete iglesias (1,9–3,22), los siete sellos (4,1–8,1), las siete trompetas (8,2–11,19) y las siete copas (15,5–16,21). A esto agregan un prólogo, una introducción y finalmente un epílogo. Por otra parte existen grandes diferencias en cuanto al lugar que ocupan las epístolas y las demás visiones dentro de la narración. Estas diferencias han llevado a E. Cuvillier a concluir que “il est difficile de mettre à jour un plan cohérent à l'ensemble des visions de l'Apocalypse de Jean”⁽¹⁾.

Sin embargo, a principios del s. XX se había impuesto la tendencia a estructurar el Apocalipsis de Juan en septenarios. Una de las propuestas mas conocidas y rigurosas es la de E. Lohmeyer en su comentario de 1926 donde afirma que “keine Schrift zeigt eine so fest in sich geschlossene und planvoll gegliederte Einheit wie sie [die Offenbarung des Johannes]”⁽²⁾. Según este autor, el número siete es “das Formschema”⁽³⁾ del Apocalipsis que llega a aplicarse no sólo en la estructura de la obra sino también en cada una de sus unidades, a punto que los poemas y el epílogo se componen de siete estrofas⁽⁴⁾. Esta postura ha permanecido, con ciertas variantes, hasta la segunda mitad del s. XX en comentarios como los de E. Lohse y M. Rist⁽⁵⁾. Paulatinamente, esta opinión ha ido perdiendo aceptación entre los críticos contemporáneos ya sea porque no hubo consenso acerca de cómo agrupar los septenarios a lo largo de la obra, o bien porque su empleo no fue considerado como parte del arte de narrar. Tampoco encontramos un estudio intertextual que analice la función y significado de los septenarios en la Biblia y en los apócrifos.

En un análisis sincrónico del Apocalipsis, el presente artículo se propone demostrar la función del número siete como una *técnica narrativa bíblica y apocalíptica* que define la estructura general del libro y da un significado

(1) E. CUVILLIER, “L'Apocalypse de Jean”, *Introduction au Nouveau Testament. Son histoire, son écriture, sa théologie* (éd. D. MARGUERAT) (Le Monde de la Bible 41; Fribourg – Paris – Montréal 2001) 386.

(2) E. LOHMEYER, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* (HNT 16; Tübingen 1926) 181.

(3) LOHMEYER, *Offenbarung*, 182.

(4) LOHMEYER, *Offenbarung*, 181, 184.

(5) E. LOHSE, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* (NTD 11; Göttingen 1979); M. RIST, *The Revelation of St. John the Divine* (The Interpreter's Bible 12; New York 1957). Para un listado detallado de quienes defienden esta posición cf. A. FEUILLET, “L'Apocalypse. État de la question”, *SN.S III*, 24–25.

particular a cada una de sus secciones. Además, el número siete será estudiado en su relación con el trono, que cumple la función de marco y de eje semántico de la obra, a fin de determinar las características dominantes de este término y verificar el movimiento concéntrico de la narración.

1. *El número siete en el contexto literario bíblico*

En la literatura bíblica canónica y en los apócrifos son conocidos ciertos valores numéricos que llevan consigo una connotación semántica particular. El siete es una de las cifras bíblicas que se emplean con frecuencia para transmitir el sentido de la perfección, de lo divino, de la plenitud y de la armonía. Esta significación no pertenece sólo a los autores del entorno bíblico sino que la encontramos también en varias culturas antiguas, tales como las culturas semíticas, la egipcia y la griega⁽⁶⁾.

El septenario bíblico más famoso e influyente es el de los siete días de Gn 1,1-2,4 que habla a cerca de “los orígenes de los cielos y de la tierra cuando fueron creados” (Gn 2,4). Este motivo literario ha sido reelaborado en el Apocalipsis, ya no para hablar del comienzo de la historia sino para referirse a su final y, sobre todo, para expresar la fe y la esperanza en una nueva creación⁽⁷⁾. Por lo tanto, a la amplia gama de significación que tiene el número siete, el Apocalipsis le sumará el matiz de *nueva creación*, el cual corona y concuerda con las ideas de perfección, plenitud y armonía.

El libro de *Daniel*, única obra enteramente apocalíptica del Antiguo Testamento, contiene el famoso texto de las setenta semanas en Dn 9. El tema central de esta perícopa es la interpretación de los dichos del profeta Jeremías en Jr 25,11-12; 29,10 que marcan el tiempo de persecución de los creyentes y finalmente la restauración del pueblo de Dios dentro del contexto histórico de la opresión babilónica y la eminente caída de Jerusalén. Daniel reinterpreta estas profecías alegóricamente y las pone en boca de un ángel para abrirlas hacia una restitución final de todo su pueblo. Al igual que en el Apocalipsis de San Juan, el énfasis de la interpretación recae en la última semana que habla de la implementación de la justicia divina (9,24)⁽⁸⁾.

“Contarás siete semanas de años, siete veces siete años... Así santificaréis el año cincuenta y pregonaréis libertad en la tierra a todos sus habitantes. Ese año os será de jubileo, y volveréis cada uno a vuestra posesión, y cada cual volverá a su familia” (Lv 25,8.10). Éste es también uno de los textos claves del Antiguo Testamento que destacan la importancia teológica de los septenarios bíblicos. Se trata aquí del año jubilar en el que se aplica la justicia y la piedad por el débil en la sociedad porque es un año en el que Dios hará su obra, el hombre detendrá todo trabajo y depositará su

⁽⁶⁾ Cf. K.H. RENGSTORF, “ἐπτὰ κτλ.”, *TWNT* II, 623-636; H. BALZ, “ἐπτὰ”, *DENT* I, 1563-1565; s.n., “Seven”, *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery* (eds. L. RYKEN – J.C. WILHOIT – T. LONGMAN) (Downers Grove – Leicester 1998) 774-775; W.H. BENNETT, “Number”, *Dictionary of the Bible* (Edinburgh 1963) 703.

⁽⁷⁾ En cuanto a las similitudes existentes en la Biblia entre el discurso acerca de la creación y el discurso apocalíptico cf. K. LÖNING – E. ZENGER, *Als Anfang schuf Gott. Biblische Schöpfungstheologien* (Düsseldorf 1997) 65-69.

⁽⁸⁾ Cf. J.J. COLLINS, *The Apocalyptic Imagination. An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (Grand Rapids – Cambridge 1998) 108-109.

confianza plena en el Señor que proveerá todas sus necesidades y mucho más (Lv 25,21-22). Este significado es reelaborado por el Trito Isaías que habla de un “año de gracia” — שְׁנַת־רַחֲמִים — (Is 61,1-2) refiriéndose ya a la salvación definitiva y universal. Finalmente, San Lucas relata en su Evangelio que Jesús inició su obra de salvación leyendo este párrafo isaiano y afirmando que en su persona se cumplía el mensaje de redención que implica el anuncio de un año de gracia, un año jubilar, definitivo y universal (Lc 4,16-22).

No son pocos los libros apocalípticos que expresan el principio teológico del siete bíblico a través de una técnica narrativa que estructura la obra. Uno de los que más se asemejan al Apocalipsis de Juan en la aplicación de esta técnica es el *Apocalipsis siríaco de Baruc* que le es contemporáneo y que también se divide en siete secciones⁽⁹⁾ para bosquejar, entre otras cosas, la figura del Mesías y su advenimiento. Las secciones están separadas, a excepción de la sexta, a través de un ayuno del vidente que normalmente dura siete días (2 Bar 5,7; 9,1-2; 12,5; 20,5). También el *Cuarto libro de Esdras*, contemporáneo al Apocalipsis siríaco de Baruc, está estructurado en siete visiones⁽¹⁰⁾. Las siete visiones están separadas ya sea por períodos de siete días de ayuno (5,21; 6,35), o por siete días de abstinencia de carnes y bebidas (9,23-25; 12,49-51), o bien por tres días de permanencia en el campo antes de recibir la visión (10,58-59; 13,58). Semejante es el *Libro de los jubileos* que divide el ciclo de los relatos de todo Gn y de Ex 1-12 en períodos de 49 años, los cuales se componen de siete etapas de siete años cada una⁽¹¹⁾. De estos datos se deduce la importancia del número siete en la narrativa apocalíptica judía contemporánea a la obra de Juan.

La misma técnica literaria de elegir un número con significación simbólica para estructurar una obra apocalíptica intertestamentaria aplican *Los testamentos de los doce patriarcas* que contiene 12 discursos de despedida para el pueblo creyente, la colección del *Libro etíope de Enoc*, el séptimo patriarca prediluviano, dividido en cinco partes y que pretende tomar el carácter de escritura a la manera del *Pentateuco* mosaico, las cinco secciones de los *Salmos* davídicos, o los cinco poemas del *Cantar de los Cantares* del rey Salomón. El *Evangelio de San Mateo* sigue este esquema al estructurarse en cinco grandes sermones de Jesús⁽¹²⁾. Finalmente, la narrativa del cuarto Evangelio está estructurada en base a siete “señales” que realiza Jesús antes del relato de la pasión y resurrección⁽¹³⁾.

⁽⁹⁾ Según APOT II, 474, las siete secciones son: 2 Ba 1-5,6; 5,7-8; 9-12,4; 12,5-20; 21-35; 36-46; 47-77.

⁽¹⁰⁾ A. DUPONT-SOMMER – M. PHILOMENKO, *La Bible. Ecrits Intertestamentaires* (Bibliothèque de la Pléiade; Paris 1987) CXI-CXII. Las siete visiones son: 4 Esd 3,1-5,19; 5,20-6,34; 6,35-9,25; 9,26-10,59; 10,60-12,51; 13,1-58; 14,1-49.

⁽¹¹⁾ DUPONT-SOMMER, *Bible*, LXX-LXXII.

⁽¹²⁾ También en el Evangelio de Mateo los septenarios juegan un rol principal. Véase por ej. la estructura de la genealogía en Mt 1,1-17, el discurso de las siete parábolas en Mt 13 y las siete peticiones del Padrenuestro en Mt 6,9-13.

⁽¹³⁾ Cf. R. SCHNACKENBURG, *Das Johannesevangelium* (HThK NT IV/1; Freiburg – Basel – Wien 1979) 345. SCHNACKENBURG no sólo se refiere a las siete señales, sino que también menciona en la misma página la existencia de siete “Bildsprüche” con la expresión ἐγὼ εἶμι a lo largo del Evangelio.

2. La estructura del Apocalipsis

La narración propiamente dicha comienza a partir de 1,9-10 con la frase verbal “estando yo en el Espíritu en el día del Señor oí detrás de mí una gran voz”. Todo lo que antecede a esto es un prólogo y un saludo epistolar (1,1-8) cuyo contenido tiene una doble función: trazar las líneas generales de la obra y su lógica ordenándola dentro del género literario judeo-cristiano de los apocalipsis, y establecer una comunicación vivaz con el lector a través del saludo epistolar⁽¹⁴⁾.

Tanto en la introducción como en el comienzo de la narración el número siete no tarda en aparecer. Por un lado tenemos “los siete espíritus que están delante de su trono” (1,4) y por el otro “las siete iglesias que están en Asia” (1,11). El número siete se instalará de allí en más para contar las acciones divinas en septenarios e intensificar así su significado de acuerdo a su orden de aparición.

Sin caer en un rigorismo estructural que resulte repetitivo y previsible para el lector, el libro del Apocalipsis se organiza con libertad y creatividad en una estructura de siete septenarios de visiones que relatan la fe y la esperanza del autor de que Dios intervendrá diligentemente para poner orden en toda la creación. A continuación se ofrece una visión de conjunto de los septenarios:

I. Primer ciclo de Visiones 1,9 –11,19

1. Los siete mensajes a las siete iglesias 1,9–3,22

Introducción: primera aproximación al Trono 1,9-20

A Éfeso 2,1-7	A Esmirna 2,8-11	A Pérgamo 2,12-17	A Tiatira 2,18-29	A Sardes 3,1-6	A Filadelfia 3,7-13	A Laodicea 3,14-22
------------------	---------------------	----------------------	----------------------	-------------------	------------------------	-----------------------

2. El libro con los siete sellos 4,1–8,1

Introducción: la visión central del Trono y su liturgia 4,1-5,14

1° Sello 6,1-2	2° Sello 6,3-4	3° Sello 6,5-6	4° sello 6,7-8	5° sello 6,9-11	6° sello 6,12-17 (7,1-17)	7° sello 8,1
-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	--------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------

3. Las siete trompetas 8,2–11,19

Primer regreso a la liturgia del Trono 8,2-6

1ª Trompeta 8,7	2ª Trompeta 8,8-9	3ª Trompeta 8,10-11	4ª Trompeta 8,12-13	5ª Trompeta 9,1-12	6ª Trompeta 9,13-21 (10,1–11,14)	7ª Trompeta 11,15-19
--------------------	----------------------	------------------------	------------------------	-----------------------	--	-------------------------

⁽¹⁴⁾ Cf. M. KARRER, *Johannesoffenbarung als Brief* (FRLANT 140; Göttingen 1986) 30.

II. Segundo Ciclo de Visiones 12,1–22,5

4. Las siete visiones de la historia 12,1–15,4

Las siete visiones de la tierra

1ª Visión La mujer y el dragón 12,1-18	2ª Visión La primera Bestia 13,1-10	3ª Visión La segunda Bestia 13,11-18	4ª Visión El Cordero sobre Sión 14,1-5	5ª Visión El anuncio del Juicio 14,6-13	6ª Visión La siega y la vendimia 14,14-20	7ª Visión El cántico de Moisés y el Cordero 15,1-4
---	--	---	---	--	--	--

5. Las siete copas 15,5–16,21

Segundo regreso a la liturgia del Trono 15,5 – 16,1

1ª copa 16,2	2ª copa 16,3	3ª copa 16,4-7	4ª copa 16,8-9	5ª copa 16,10-11	6ª copa 16,12-16	7ª copa 16,17-21
-----------------	-----------------	-------------------	-------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

6. La caída de la Gran Babilonia 17,1–19,10

7. Las siete visiones del fin de los tiempos 19,11–22,5

Tercer regreso a la liturgia del Trono y unificación definitiva de cielos y tierra

La Parusía 19,11-16	El llamado 19,17-18	La batalla 19,19-21	La captura de la bestia 20,1-3	Los mil años 20,4-10	El juicio final 20,11-15	La nueva creación 21,1–22,5
------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Esta cuadro permite visualizar con claridad el mensaje central del Apocalipsis: La culminación de la obra salvífica del Cordero que comprende la destrucción definitiva del mal y la *apokatástasis* de la creación. La narración se despliega en siete etapas cuidadosamente estructuradas en grupos de siete, de manera que el *siete veces siete* acentúe el carácter divino de lo revelado. Sólo la sexta etapa no respeta este paradigma debido a la naturaleza y el contenido de su relato: la derrota del caos. La séptima etapa comienza con la parusía y describe la batalla final que culmina con la realización de la nueva creación (21,1–22,5). Éste es el séptimo elemento de la séptima etapa del Apocalipsis y su posición contiene un fuerte simbolismo. Toda la obra ha ido ascendiendo paulatinamente hasta llegar a este punto cumbre para poder detenerse a relatar minuciosamente la visión del nuevo cielo, la nueva tierra y la nueva Jerusalén en base a las promesas contenidas en las escrituras y aplicando sus motivos y modelos de narración. Ez 40–48 aporta los rasgos principales de la nueva Jerusalén; Isaías, Ezequiel y Zacarías están presentes con sus expresiones y figuras literarias; Gn 2 es la fuente de inspiración para el motivo del río y el árbol en 22,1-2. Y éstos son sólo algunos de los ejemplos más evidentes.

Por otra parte, la presente lectura macronarrativa del Apocalipsis resalta la integración de las siete epístolas al conjunto de la narración. Este primer septenario forma el discurso inaugural del Hijo del Hombre glorificado (1,13) a las comunidades de fieles y su contenido es tan importante que toma el carácter de escritura⁽¹⁵⁾. W.J. Harrington señala con razón que varios motivos

⁽¹⁵⁾ Nótese la insistencia en el imperativo “escribe” al principio de cada epístola y en 1,19. Así, por ej., el motivo “escritura” será retomado en el próximo septenario del libro con los siete sellos y en 10,9-10.

literarios mencionados en las epístolas a modo de apertura, serán desarrollados posteriormente y a lo largo de la obra⁽¹⁶⁾. Cada epístola es una acción directa de Cristo en la que anuncia su pronta visitación y se compromete solemnemente a instaurar su Reino.

Después de haber expuesto algunas razones de contenido a favor de un Apocalipsis compuesto de siete septenarios, resta corroborar si la estructura propuesta se atiene a los articuladores lógicos utilizados por el autor. Esta labor se ve favorecida gracias a los cuatro septenarios explícitos: el de las siete iglesias, el de los sellos, el de las trompetas y el de las copas. Sólo resta constatar si los grupos de las siete visiones de la historia (12,1–15,4) y el de las siete visiones finales (21,1–22,5) forman, cada uno, un septenario⁽¹⁷⁾. En ambos grupos el autor se vale de un único articulador lógico para iniciar una nueva escena, la expresión *καὶ εἶδον*, que aparece al comienzo de cada señal y de cada visión⁽¹⁸⁾, excepto en 12,1 cuyo comienzo cumple con una función macronarrativa muy particular, tal como se verá más adelante. Esta misma expresión ha servido anteriormente para separar algunos componentes de otros septenarios⁽¹⁹⁾ aún cuando el elemento delimitante en ellos era la apertura de un nuevo sello o el sople de una trompeta. Los únicos dos septenarios que no enumeran explícitamente sus siete elementos están, pues, claramente delimitados por la expresión *καὶ εἶδον* al comienzo de cada visión.

Tanto el grupo de los siete sellos (4,1–8,1) como el de las siete trompetas (8,2–11,19) cuentan con un relato intermedio entre el sexto y el séptimo elemento que despiertan la expectativa por el desenlace de la narración y dan al lector las pautas para interpretar todo el septenario. Se trata del díptico de los 144.000 y las naciones en 7,1–17 y el díptico del libro y los dos testigos en 10,1–11,14. La integridad del septenario no se ve afectada de ninguna manera gracias al recurso narrativo de reanudar la cuenta del séptimo elemento faltante en 8,1 y 11,15, y especialmente gracias a los tres *ayes* en 9,12; 11,14 que enlazan la quinta, sexta y séptima trompeta.

3. El enlace de los septenarios con las escenas del trono

Los cuatro grupos de las iglesias, los sellos, las trompetas y las copas disponen además de una característica muy destacada que marca el eje central de la obra y nos ayuda a descubrir la trama de la macronarración. Cada uno de estos grupos comienza con una introducción en forma de relato cuyo marco es el trono divino. Por lo tanto, el Apocalipsis no sólo comienza y concluye con las palabras del que está sentado en el trono (4,2; 21,5), sino que

⁽¹⁶⁾ W.J. HARRINGTON, *Revelation* (SPS 16; Collegeville, Minnesota 1993) 55–58.

⁽¹⁷⁾ La sección referente a la caída de la Gran Babilonia (17,1–19,10) queda excluida por no estar estructurada como un septenario. Con respecto a su forma y función, véase p. 262.

⁽¹⁸⁾ En 13,1.11; 14,1.6.14; 15,1; 19,11.17.19; 20,1.4.11; 21,1. Dentro de las dos colecciones la expresión *καὶ εἶδον* aparece también en 15,2 y en 20,12 para enfatizar el inicio de la visión e introducir un elemento o personaje importante en la narración: “un mar de vidrio mezclado con fuego” (15,2) y “los muertos, grandes y pequeños, de pie ante Dios” (20,12). LOHMEYER, *Offenbarung*, 183 considera también a la expresión *καὶ ἴκονσα* como una “einleitende Formel”.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Cf. 6,1.5.12; 8,2; 9,1; 10,1.

también se detiene en estas introducciones de sección para recordar a los lectores que toda acción es iniciada desde la corte celestial.

A través de la frase “estando yo en el Espíritu en el día del Señor...” (1,10) el autor nos traslada desde un lugar geográfico fácil de localizar, la isla de Patmos, hacia un mundo misterioso y poderoso al que sólo él tuvo acceso por gracia de Dios a fin de revelar al lector todo lo que vio y oyó. Es un paso entre la historia de la humanidad y la historia divina, un portal hacia lo desconocido. La primera descripción del trono en 1,12-20 revela un interés muy especial de Dios por el devenir del ser humano y por sus iglesias. A lo largo del primer septenario toda la acción se realiza en el marco narrativo del trono. Cristo dicta a Juan siete mensajes para siete iglesias. La trama es muy simple, Cristo emite un mensaje y Juan lo recibe.

En 4,1 – 5,14 tenemos la introducción más larga de todos los septenarios. Es la introducción a la apertura del libro de los siete sellos. La acción sigue desarrollándose frente al trono celestial. La gran diferencia es que el autor pasará a describir todo lo que sucede en ese entorno: el enfoque se va ampliando para mostrar a los cuatro seres vivientes, a los ángeles y a los 24 ancianos alrededor del trono y para relatar los servicios litúrgicos que ellos celebran. Es la escena central de toda la obra⁽²⁰⁾. Aquí se realiza la acción decisiva que cambiará el curso del eón humano y del eón celestial. El “Cordero como inmolado” (5,6) decide abrir el libro sellado y desencadenar así una serie de acciones que culminarán con la instauración de su Reino. A cada sello que el Cordero abre en el hemisferio celestial le corresponde un drama cósmico sobre la tierra, confirmando de esta manera los fuertes lazos existente entre ambos mundos y destacando la importancia de la revelación que el vidente comparte en su obra.

Una vez abierto el séptimo sello la acción sobre la tierra se detiene. Sólo queda un silencio incompleto, la calma anterior a la tempestad (8,1). El relato nos conduce de regreso al trono donde la celebración litúrgica continúa. Siete ángeles reciben de Dios⁽²¹⁾ siete trompetas que serán el motivo central del segundo septenario. Una vez más el sonar de cada trompeta repercute en una catástrofe universal que confirma el arribo del fin de los tiempos. Con el sonar de la séptima trompeta se declara la llegada de Dios y de su Cristo para el juicio (11,15.18). Este primer regreso al trono junto con las siete trompetas sirvió para relatar desde una perspectiva diferente y con una variación de temas y de plagas el mismo drama universal al que se refería el septenario de los sellos. Gracias al motivo de los septenarios el autor logra una narrativa dinámica sin haber avanzado hasta ahora ni en el tiempo ni en el lugar.

A partir de 12,1 el vidente se instala sobre la tierra. Ha abandonado su ubicación privilegiada en la bóveda celestial, cerca del trono y ha regresado a su condición de creatura terrenal para relatar el devenir de los creyentes y los pecadores a través de visiones que se asemejan a las comparaciones — מַשְׁלִים — de la literatura judía y a las parábolas de Jesús. La profunda relación que tienen estas comparaciones con la historia y con el futuro de la humanidad, se expresa bajo la forma de visiones y señales que sirven para instruir al creyente

⁽²⁰⁾ U. SCHNELLE, *The History and Theology of the New Testament Writings* (London 1998) 528 sostiene que “a key role is played by the throneroom vision of 4,1–5,14”.

⁽²¹⁾ Nótese el *passivum divinum* ἑδόθησαν en 8,2.

y exhortarlo. No se trata de señales que marcan tiempos, sino de parábolas que enseñan a leer la historia desde la perspectiva del Reino venidero.

En 15,5–16,1 el relato se instala por tercera vez en el trono celestial desde donde sucede el desenlace final de la historia. La narración retoma por última vez el motivo de siete ángeles que realizan siete acciones semejantes, en este caso el derramamiento de las siete copas “llenas de la ira de Dios” (15,7) que producirán tribulaciones sin igual. Esta vez, la séptima copa no causará ni silencio como en 8,1 ni el anuncio de la llegada del Reino como en 11,15–19, sino que traerá consigo la caída de todos los reinos del mundo y el deterioro de la vieja creación. Además, Dios declarará con la séptima copa su batalla final en contra de la Gran Ciudad, la Gran Babilonia (16,19).

De allí en más, la sexta etapa de la macronarración, la caída de la Gran Babilonia en 17,1–19,10 se presenta como la continuación inmediata a la declaración de guerra y como la *conditio sine qua non* para que se realice la instauración del Reino. La sexta etapa se diferencia de todas las demás en que no está estructurada internamente como un septenario. Las plagas llegan a la Gran Babilonia “en un solo día” (18,8) y sus riquezas son puestas en ruinas “en una hora” (18,17). La caída de la Gran Ciudad es causa de alegría para los santos, los apóstoles y los profetas porque así se ha hecho justicia a su causa (18,20). En esta etapa final del Apocalipsis, Dios derrota el poder de los reinos mundanos, la autoridad suprema entre los hombres, el último bastión que se opone al dominio absoluto de Dios sobre la creación. Mientras reste un antitestimonio a la verdadera justicia, mientras haya quien corrompa la tierra con su prostitución (19,2) y gobierne en base a principios ajenos a la voluntad de Dios, la creación seguirá sufriendo hasta que el Cordero haya ganado la batalla final⁽²²⁾. No es casualidad que la sexta etapa esté dedicada a la erradicación del caos y del mal. En su carácter de cifra anterior al siete, el número seis se vuelve símbolo de la imperfección, de la voluntad que va en contra de Dios, del falso profeta y de la muerte. A esto hace alusión el Apocalipsis cuando describe la segunda bestia en 13,18 y le aplica el triple seis⁽²³⁾. La sexta etapa no puede estar constituida en siete partes por dos razones: porque rebatiría su significado de imperfección y de no-divino y porque la victoria de Dios sobre el mal dejaría de ser fulminante y efectiva en una sola acción.

Tras el anuncio de que la humareda de la Gran Ciudad “ha de subir por los siglos de los siglos” (19,3) se relata la instauración definitiva del Reino del Cordero. Estamos en el séptimo septenario de la narración, que avanza más allá del eón de la historia y se arriesga, en base a todo lo revelado, a presentar el futuro de los creyentes en lo poco que queda de la vieja creación (19,11–20,15) y en el momento de la unificación del señorío en los cielos y la tierra. Esta unificación sucederá alrededor del único trono verdadero en el que

⁽²²⁾ En lo que se refiere al concepto originalmente profético de un *éschaton* irreversible y necesario que viene acompañado de un nuevo comienzo, cf. P.N. TARAZI, *The Old Testament: An Introduction*. Prophetic Traditions (New York 1994) II, 4–16. Dicho concepto se comporta como un motivo literario constante y decisivo en casi todos los escritos del Antiguo y Nuevo Testamento.

⁽²³⁾ Como un antecedente bíblico al significado del número seis, cf. las dimensiones de la estatua del rey Nabucodonosor en Dn 3,1. Ver también los comentarios acerca del número seis en HARRINGTON, *Revelation*, 144; CUVILLIER, *Apocalypse*, 392; BENNETT, “Number”, 703.

se sienta el Cordero, rodeado por la única ciudad verdadera, la Nueva Jerusalén (21–22).

Es así como la macronarración comienza y culmina en el trono pero con una gran variación. Al principio el trono era una verdad oculta a la que sólo se accedía por medio de la revelación mientras que la creación sufría las consecuencias de falsos reyes y falsas leyes que aumentaban la corrupción. Al final, el trono es una realidad accesible a todos porque se trata de una creación nueva donde residen los hombres que perseveraron en contra de la falsedad y la mentira y cuyo señorío, el señorío divino, abarca todo el universo⁽²⁴⁾.

*
* *

El Apocalipsis según San Juan adopta una técnica narrativa presente en el entorno bíblico apocalíptico que está fuertemente ligada al acto divino de crear. Con esta técnica el vidente relata el fin del sufrimiento y el comienzo de una nueva creación en la que Dios “enjugará toda lágrima... y ya no habrá más muerte, ni habrá más llanto ni clamor ni dolor” (21,4). El Apocalipsis deja asentado que la lucha por la erradicación definitiva del caos y del mal es una obra divina en la que el hombre sólo participa con su fe, perseverancia y, sobre todo, con su testimonio. El siete es un número divino y las acciones que se realizan son propias y exclusivas de Dios.

El trono es el escenario central de toda la acción y el autor conduce al lector a ese lugar en tres momentos diferentes anteriores a la batalla final en contra de toda falsa autoridad e injusticia.

La estructura del Apocalipsis no es, por tanto, indefinible sino que ella misma conduce el contenido expuesto y lo enmarca de manera que esta revelación se proyecte como continuidad de los escritos canónicos y como promesa de salvación para quienes crean y exclamen *Marana tha*.

St. John of Damascus Institute of Theology
University of Balamand
P.O. Box 100
Tripoli 13002010 – Lebanon

Daniel AYUCH

SUMMARY

This article investigates the function of number seven as a narrative device and as the main structural pattern in the macronarrative of the Book of Revelation. Considering the final instauration of the Holy Throne in heaven and on earth as the plot of the story, the structuring of the book in septenaries leads the reader through a gradual fulfillment of the New Creation and to the ultimate destruction of evil.

⁽²⁴⁾ Quien haya llegado a leer la totalidad de la obra habrá sido destinatario de siete bienaventuranzas que instan a la perseverancia y a tener fe en el testimonio de lo escrito: una introductoria en singular y plural a la vez (1,3), tres en singular (16,15; 20,6; 22,7) y tres en plural (14,13; 19,9; 22,14). Estas bienaventuranzas confirman la presencia latente de varias técnicas de septenarios en el Apocalipsis de Juan que el lector iniciado en escritos de este género debió saber interpretar.

Der mündliche Faktor: Teilanalogien zu den *Minor Agreements* aus der Oral Poetry-Forschung und der experimentellen Gedächtnispsychologie

Die *Minor Agreements* werden gelegentlich als "die eigentliche Schwäche der Zwei-Quellen-Theorie" bezeichnet⁽¹⁾. Eines der Hauptergebnisse eines Symposiums, das 1991 in Göttingen zum Thema veranstaltet wurde, lautet, die Problematik der *Minor Agreements* verdiene "in der künftigen Synoptikerforschung eine größere Aufmerksamkeit"⁽²⁾. Dabei solle speziell "der Faktor mündliche Tradition" nicht außer acht gelassen werden⁽³⁾. Diese Anregung greife ich im vorliegenden Diskussionsbeitrag auf. Dies geschieht in dem Bewußtsein, daß der hier weiterentwickelte Lösungsvorschlag zu den *Minor Agreements* kürzlich mit zwei Argumenten als gänzlich ungeeignet zurückgewiesen wurde: Das menschliche Gedächtnis erinnere sich nicht exakt, sondern funktioniere immer kreativ. Und mündliche Überlieferung transportiere nie den Wortlaut, sondern nur die Struktur eines Textes⁽⁴⁾.

1. Die *Minor Agreements* in den synoptischen Evangelien

Zwischen Matthäus und Lukas gibt es im Markusstoff bekanntlich zwei Arten von Übereinstimmungen gegenüber Markus, positive *Agreements* (Mt und Lk stimmen im Wortlaut gegen Mk überein) und negative (Mt und Lk lassen gemeinsam ein Wort des Mk aus). Die positiven *Agreements*, auf die ich mich im folgenden aufgrund ihrer Aussagekraft beschränke, zerfallen in zwei Gruppen. Sie stimmen entweder gegenüber einer Lücke oder gegenüber einer alternativen Formulierung des Markustextes überein⁽⁵⁾. Anders als Neirynck zähle ich nur solche Worte als echte *Agreements*, die in den beiden Parallelfassungen vollständig identisch sind. Außerdem kennzeichne ich neben den mt-lk (*Minor Agreements*) auch die Übereinstimmungen zwischen Matthäus und Markus gegen Lukas (mt-mk *Agreements*) und die Übereinstimmungen zwischen Markus und Lukas gegen Matthäus (mk-lk *Agreements*).

Um zu erklären, wie die *Minor Agreements* zwischen Matthäus und

⁽¹⁾ So W. SCHMITHALS, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien* (Berlin 1985) 188.

⁽²⁾ So G. STRECKER im Vorwort zu dem von ihm herausgegebenen Sammelband, *Minor Agreements*. Symposium Göttingen 1991 (GThA 50; Göttingen 1993) 10.

⁽³⁾ STRECKER, *Minor Agreements*, 18.

⁽⁴⁾ So J.D. CROSSAN, *The Birth of Christianity*. Discovering What Happened in the Years Immediately After the Execution of Jesus (San Francisco 1998) 52-58, vor allem gegen R.E. Brown.

⁽⁵⁾ Eine Kennzeichnung sämtlicher *Minor Agreements* findet sich — mit je eigenem System — bei F. NEIRYNCK, *The Minor Agreements in a Horizontal-Line Synopsis* (SNTA 15; Leuven 1991) 11-91; A. ENNULAT, *Die "Minor Agreements"*. Untersuchungen zu einer offenen Frage des synoptischen Problems (WUNT 2/62; Tübingen 1994) 472-594; R.B. VINSON, "The Significance of the Minor Agreements as an Argument Against the Two-Document-Hypothesis" (Ph.D. Dissertation; Duke University 1984) 11-373.

Lukas gegen Markus entstanden sind, stehen mehrere Modelle zur Diskussion. Setzt man die Markuspriorität voraus, sind es primär die folgenden. (a) Vor allem seit B.H. Streeter⁽⁶⁾ ist mehrfach angenommen worden, die *Minor Agreements* seien (teilweise) durch (unabsichtliche) Textverderbnis bzw. (absichtliche) Textassimilation entstanden⁽⁷⁾. (b) Andere führen die *Minor Agreements* auf eine literarische Beziehung zwischen dem ersten und dritten Evangelium zurück, sei es, daß Lukas den Matthäus benutzte⁽⁸⁾, sei es, daß Matthäus von Lukas abhängt⁽⁹⁾. (c) Ein drittes Modell nimmt an, die (meisten) *Minor Agreements* seien im Zuge der unabhängigen Redaktion des Markustextes durch Matthäus und Lukas entstanden⁽¹⁰⁾. (d) In jüngerer Zeit haben sich wieder eine Reihe von Forschern dafür ausgesprochen, die *Minor Agreements* auf einen Deuteromarkus zurückzuführen⁽¹¹⁾.

⁽⁶⁾ *The Four Gospels. A Study of Origins* (London 1924) 293-331, etwa 306: "a large number of the Agreements are due ... to later scribes"; zur Geschichte dieses Deutungsansatzes siehe E.W. BURROWS, "The Use of Textual Theories to Explain Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark", *Studies in New Testament Language and Text*. FS G.D. Kilpatrick (ed. J.K. ELLIOTT) (NTS 44; Leiden 1976) 87-99, und F. WHEELER, "Textual Criticism and the Synoptic Problem: A Textual Commentary on the Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark" (Ph.D. Dissertation; Baylor University 1985) 54-85.

⁽⁷⁾ Neuerdings hat WHEELER, "Textual Criticism", 52 *Minor Agreements*, die als Folge von Textverderbnis bzw. Textassimilation erklärt worden sind, mit einem ausführlichen textkritischen Kommentar versehen (86-305) und die textkritische Erklärung der *Minor Agreements* in Frage gestellt (307-311).

⁽⁸⁾ So beispielsweise R. MORGENTHAU, *Statistische Synopse* (Zürich 1971) 301-303, und ausführlicher V.S. YOON, "Did the Evangelist Luke Use the Canonical Gospel of Matthew?" (Th.D. Dissertation; Faculty of the Graduate Theological Union, Berkley 1985) 85-126; M.D. GOULDER, *Luke: A New Paradigm* (JSNTSS 20; Sheffield 1989) und ihm folgend M. GOODACRE, *The Case Against Q. Studies in the Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem* (Harrisburg 2002) 152-169, der die Lösungsmöglichkeit "shared oral tradition" nur in einer Fußnote (160 Anm. 29) streift.

⁽⁹⁾ So neuerdings wieder M. HENGEL, *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ. An Investigation in the Collection and Origin of the Canonical Gospels* (London 2000) 173-174, 196.

⁽¹⁰⁾ So J. SCHMID, *Matthäus und Lukas. Eine Untersuchung zum Verhältnis ihrer Evangelien* (BibS[F] 23/2-4; Freiburg 1930) 31-167, und gegenwärtig vor allem F. NEIRYNCK, "The Minor Agreements and the Two-Source Theory" (1991), *Minor Agreements* (ed. G. STRECKER) 25-63. VINSON, "Significance of the Minor Agreements", hat die Hypothese, Matthäus und Lukas hätten ihre Minor Agreements im Zuge einer unabhängigen Benutzung ihrer Markusvorlage erzeugt, in Frage gestellt. Sein Hauptargument ruht auf dem Befund, daß sich ein so hoher Anteil an *Minor Agreements* wie zwischen Matthäus und Lukas gegen Markus (durchschnittlich 21,2%) weder in analogen Experimenten (durchschnittlich 2,1%) erzeugen noch in den parallelen Zitaten der altkirchlichen Apologeten (durchschnittlich 3,3%) nachweisen läßt. Für eine kritische Auseinandersetzung mit Vinsons Argumentation siehe T.A. FRIEDRICH, "The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark. Critical Observations on R.B. Vinson's Statistical Analysis", *ETL* 65 (1989) 395-408.

⁽¹¹⁾ So im Anschluß an A. FUCHS, *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Matthäus und Lukas. Ein Beitrag zur Quellenkritik* (AnBib 49; Rom 1971) 168-170, vor allem CHR. NIEMAND, *Studien zu den Minor Agreements der synoptischen Verklärungspetitionen. Eine Untersuchung der literarkritischen Relevanz der gemeinsamen Abweichungen des Matthäus und Lukas von Markus 9,2-10 für die synoptische Frage* (EHS 23/352; Frankfurt 1989), J. RAUSCHER, *Vom Messiasgeheimnis zur Lehre der Kirche. Die Entwicklung der sogenannten Parabeltheorie in der synoptischen Tradition* (Mk 4,10-12 par Mt 13,10-17 par Lk 8,9-10) (Desselbrunn 1990) und ENNULAT, "Minor Agreements".

Im folgenden geht es mir nicht um eine kritische Auseinandersetzung mit diesen Erklärungsmodellen. Es soll lediglich gezeigt werden, daß die Bedeutung der mündlichen Überlieferung des Markusstoffes für die Entstehung der *Minor Agreements* häufig unterschätzt wird. Die mündliche Tradition ist zur Erklärung der "kleinen Übereinstimmungen" bekanntlich nicht nur von Vertretern einer reinen Traditionshypothese⁽¹²⁾, sondern auch von Anhängern der Markuspriorität herangezogen worden⁽¹³⁾. Um den hohen Erklärungswert des mündlichen Faktors für das Problem der *Minor Agreements* zu belegen, vergleiche ich eine etwa 50 Wörter umfassende Perikope der synoptischen Tripeltradition zunächst mit analogen Parallelfassungen aus der mündlichen Dichtung (Teil 2) und anschließend mit einem analogen Phänomen aus der Experimentalpsychologie (Teil 3). Ob bzw. wie der mündliche Faktor mit einem oder mehreren der oben genannten Erklärungsmodelle (a-d) zu kombinieren ist, steht hier nicht zur Debatte. Als synoptischer Beispieltext dient das Gleichnis vom Senfkorn (Mt 13:31-32 par).

Die (mt-lk) *Minor Agreements* (MAs) werden fett gedruckt. Die mt-mk *Agreements* sind einfach unterstrichen, die mk-lk *Agreements* kursiv gesetzt. Unmarkiert bleiben die dreifachen Wortlautübereinstimmungen der Tripeltradition und das jeweilige Sondergut. In den Textbeispielen aus analogen Parallelversionen (Teil 2 und 3) wird entsprechend verfahren.

Mt 13:31-32	Mk 4:30-32	Lk 13:18-19
<p>"Ἀλλήν παραβολὴν παρέθηκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων· ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν κόκκῳ σινάπεως, ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος ἐσπείρει ἐν τῷ ἄγρῳ αὐτοῦ· ὁ μικρότερον μὲν ἐστὶν πάντων τῶν σπερμάτων, ὅταν αὐξηθῇ μείζον τῶν λαχάνων ἐστὶν καὶ γίνεται δένδρον, ὥστε ἐλθεῖν τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ κατασκηνοῦν ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ.</p>	<p>Καὶ ἔλεγεν· πῶς ὁμοιωσάμεν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ ἐν τίνι αὐτὴν παραβολὴ θάμεν; ὡς κόκκῳ σινάπεως, ὃς ὅταν σπαρῇ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, μικρότερον ὢν πάντων τῶν σπερμάτων τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ὅταν σπαρῇ, ἀναβαίνει καὶ γίνεται μείζον πάντων τῶν λαχάνων καὶ ποιεῖ κλάδους μεγάλους, ὥστε δύνασθαι ὑπὸ τὴν σκιὰν αὐτοῦ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνοῦν.</p>	<p>"Ἐλεγεν οὖν· τίνι ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τίνι ὁμοιωσάμεν αὐτήν;¹⁸ ὁμοία ἐστὶν κόκκῳ σινάπεως, ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος ἐβόλεν εἰς κῆπον ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ ἤρξησεν καὶ ἐγένετο εἰς δένδρον, καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκήνωσεν ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ.</p>
<p>50 Wörter insgesamt 12 mt-lk <i>Agreements</i> 12 mt-mk <i>Agreements</i></p>	<p>57 Wörter insgesamt 12 mt-mk <i>Agreements</i> 5 mk-lk <i>Agreements</i></p>	<p>40 Wörter insgesamt 12 mt-lk <i>Agreements</i> 5 mk-lk <i>Agreements</i></p>

⁽¹²⁾ A.B. LORD, "The Gospels as Oral Traditional Literature", *The Relationship Among the Gospels*, An Interdisciplinary Dialogue (ed. W.O. WALKER) (San Antonio 1978); B.I. REICKE, "Die Entstehungsverhältnisse der synoptischen Evangelien", *ANRW* II.25.2 (1984) 1758-1791; ID., *The Roots of the Synoptic Gospels* (Philadelphia 1986).

⁽¹³⁾ Etwa von SCHMID, *Matthäus und Lukas*, 173-174, und besonders von G.D. FEE, "A Text-Critical Look at the Synoptic Problem", *NT* 22 (1980) 12-28, hier 23-28.

In diesen Paralleltexten von rund 50 Wörtern Länge stehen 12 (mt-lk) *Minor Agreements* einerseits 12 mt-mk *Agreements* und andererseits 5 mk-lk *Agreements* gegenüber. Es stellt sich die Frage, ob ein analoger Befund auch im Bereich der mündlichen Dichtung (Teil 2) und im Bereich der Gedächtnispsychologie (Teil 3) nachweisbar ist.

2. Eine Analogie aus der Oral Poetry-Forschung

Die mündliche Dichtung, speziell die mündliche Epik, die schriftlos entsteht und überliefert wird (engl. 'oral poetry')⁽¹⁴⁾, hat sich bei einigen Völkern bis in die moderne Zeit erhalten. Einen wesentlichen Fortschritt machte die Erforschung des mündlichen Epos, als seit den 30er Jahren des vergangenen Jahrhunderts Milman Parry und sein Schüler Albert B. Lord in entlegenen Gebieten Jugoslawiens rund 12.000 solcher Texte von 200 bis zu 13.000 Versen Länge (bzw. 16 Stunden Vortragsdauer) aufzeichneten.

Eine der zentralen Beobachtungen, die Parry und Lord anhand dieser (serbo-) kroatischen Texte, die heute in der Harvard University deponiert sind, machten, betraf deren Wortlaut. Wie die Forscher feststellten, wiederholten die südjugoslawischen Epensänger (Guslare) ihre mündlichen Dichtungen niemals in derselben Form. Sie komponierten jedesmal, wenn sie ein Epos vortrugen, im Rahmen seines Erzählgerüsts (und aus einer Fülle stereotyper Formeln und Motive) eine neue Fassung desselben. Im Zuge jedes mündlichen Vortrags entstand, ohne daß die Sänger sich dessen voll bewußt gewesen wären, ein neues Werk ("composition during oral performance"). Dabei spielte das wörtliche Auswendiglernen eines vorgegebenen Stoffes eine untergeordnete Rolle⁽¹⁵⁾.

Ein solches mündliches Epos Jugoslawiens, das von verschiedenen Sängern vorgetragen wurde, trägt den Titel "Der Sänger von Bagdad". Eine 1934 von Salih Ugljanin vorgetragene Fassung beginnt, nach einem kurzen Prolog, folgendermaßen⁽¹⁶⁾:

Jednom vaktu a starom zemanu,
Sultan Seljim rata jotvorijo
Sa kraljicom od grada Bagdata.
E! Spremi sultan sto hiljada vojske,
Jenjičara sina njegovoga,
A sa vojskom kuhvet i topove.
Spremi š njima paše i vezire,
Pa sidoše do grada Bagdata.
Bijo Bagdat dvadeset godina
Bez promena danjem i po noći,

Once in the days of old,
Sultan Selim declared war
on the queen of the city of Bagdad.
The sultan sent an army of a hundred thousand men,
the Janissaries, his sons,
and with the army he sent ammunition and cannon.
He sent with them also his pashas and viziers,
and they marched to the city of Bagdad.
They attacked Bagdad for twenty years,
day and night without ceasing,

⁽¹⁴⁾ Einen Einstieg in diese Forschungsrichtung bieten E.R. HAYMES, *Das mündliche Epos*. Eine Einführung in die "Oral Poetry" Forschung (Stuttgart 1977) und P. ZUMTHOR, *Oral Poetry*. An Introduction (franz. 1983; Minneapolis 1990). Die neueste Literatur nennt G. VON WILPERT, "Oral Poetry", *Sachwörterbuch Literatur* (Stuttgart 2001) 576.

⁽¹⁵⁾ A.B. LORD, *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge 1960) bes. 99-123, etwa 119-120; vgl. W.T. WALLACE – D.C. RUBIN, "Memory of a Ballad Singer", *Practical Aspects of Memory*. Current Research and Issues (ed. M.M. GRUENBERG u.a.) (Chichester 1988) I, 257-262.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Der Originaltext findet sich in *Serbocroatian Heroic Songs* (eds. M. PARRY – A.B. LORD) (Cambridge 1953-54) II, 8, die englische Übersetzung von LORD ebd. I, 68.

Nit' mu vara nađe jo' duvara.
 A deljatim da učini kvara.
 Uhalji se careva ordija.
 U ordiju boljes pogodila.
 Paše namah knjigu načinjelji.
 Spremiše je našemu sultanu:
 "Sultan Selim, od svijeta sunce!
 Fajda nije da biješ Bagdata.
 Mi ga bismo dvadeset godina.
 Nit' odbismo vara jo' duvara,
 Ni Bagdatu nalazismo vrata,
 Ni kamena koliko kremenā".

but they could discover no break in the walls,
 to say nothing of causing any damage.
 Then the imperial army fell on evil times.
 A plague attacked the host.
 The pashas straightway prepared a letter
 and sent it to our sultan:
 "Sultan Selim, light of the world!
 It is of no use to attack Bagdad.
 We have attacked it for twenty years.
 We have neither disturbed the mortar in the walls,
 nor have we found the gates of Bagdad,
 nor have we chipped from the stones a piece the size
 of a flint".

Der Guslar Salih Ugljanin hat das Lied "Der Snger von Bagdad" im jugoslawischen Novi Pazar im Jahre 1934 in drei verschiedenen Fassungen vorgetragen. Am 23. Juli wurde der Text nach seinem Diktat mitgeschrieben (Fassung A: 1.386 Verse). Am 24. Juli (Fassung B: 1.272 Verse) und am 22. November (Fassung C: 1.620 Verse) desselben Jahres wurde mitgeschnitten, wie er denselben Stoff vorsang. Die drei Fassungen weisen markante Unterschiede und bereinstimmungen im Wortlaut auf⁽¹⁷⁾. Fr unsere Fragestellung sind die positiven Agreements von Interesse, die wie im synoptischen Vergleich gekennzeichnet sind:

Fassung C (22. Nov. 1934)	Fassung A (23. Juli 1934)	Fassung B (24. Juli 1934)
Jednom vaktu a starom zemanu. <u>Sultan</u> Seljim rata jotvorijo Sa kraljicom od grada Bagdata. E! Spremi sultan sto hiljada vojske, Jenjičara sina njegovoga, A <u>sa</u> vojskom kuhvet i topove . Spremi š njima paše i vezire .	Jednog vakta od starog zemana <u>Sultan</u> Selim otvorijo rata Sa kraljicom od grada Bagdata. Opremio sto hiljada vojske, Janjičara sve <u>sina</u> njegovoga, I pred njima paše i vezire , I <u>sa</u> šnjima od rata topove , I <u>za njima tajin</u> i <u>dephana</u> ,	Ej! Jednom vaktu a starom zemanu , Ej! car Sulejman rata jotvorijo Sa kraljicom od grada Bagdata. Spremi sultan sto hiljada vojske, Jenjičara suznja nevoljnoga, A za njima paše i veziri. Pa him tajin ide, pa kuhveta, A <u>za njima kuhvet</u> i topovi,
Pa sidoše do grada Bagdata .	Pa <i>pod</i> Bagdat kraljici na grada, Pa s kraljicom kavgu otvorijo.	E! <i>pod</i> Bagdatom bijeljijem gradom, E! da biju kraljici Bagdata, Kad šljegoše do grada Bagdata , E! tresahu carevi topovi. E! Biju Bagdat bijeloga grada,
Biju Bagdat dvadeset godina Bez promena danjem i po noći,	Bagdat biju dvadeset godina .	E! biju ga topom i kuhvetom; Nit' odbiju vara jod duvara, A deljatim ućinjeti kvara; Niko ne zna koliko vremena, Nikomu nać' od Bagdata vrata .
Nit' mu vara nađe jo' duvara. A deljatim da učini kvara.	Ni odbijo vara o' duvara, Ni Bagdatu ućinijo kvara, Ni Bagdatu nalazijo vrata , I na vojsku boles' udarila.	

⁽¹⁷⁾ PARRY und LORD bieten die drei Texte in *Serbocroatian Heroic Songs*, II, 8.26.40. Fr eine ausfhrlichere Diskussion verwandter Aspekte siehe A.D. BAUM, "Oral poetry und synoptische Frage. Analogien zu Umfang, Variation und Art der synoptischen Wortlautidentitt", *TZ* 59 (2003) 17-34, hier 18-23.

Uhalji **se careva ordija**.
U ordiju boljes pogodila.

Paše namah knjigu načinjelji.
Spremiše je **našemu sultanu**:
"Sultan Selim, od svijeta sunce!
Fajda nije da biješ Bagdata.

Mi ga bismo dvadeset godina.
Nit' odbismo vara jo' **duvara**,

Ni Bagdatu nalazismo vrata,
Ni kamena koljiko kremenā".

105 Wörter insgesamt
25 C-B Agreements (MAs)
15 C-A Agreements

Paše pišu **našemu sultanu**:
"Sultan *care*, ogrijalo sunce!
Nije kabil *Bagdat* prifatiti.

Mi ga bismo dvadeset godina;

Ne *nađosmo* od *Bagdata* vrata,

Ni mogosmo učiniti *kvara*.
Da vratimo vojsku i topove,
Jer se Bagdat prifatit' ne more".

110 Wörter insgesamt
15 C-A Agreements
11 A-B Agreements

E! Biše Bagdat dvadeset godina,
Dvades puno a više četiri.
Pobolje **se careva ordija**.
Murtati se gradu povraťiše,
Caru sitne knjige povraćaju:

Ej! "Sultan *care*, jogrijalo sunce!
Nij' ti **fajda** *Bagdat* udariti,
E! Iako ga prifatit' nećemo.
Njega bismo dvadeset godina.
Ej! **Nit' odbismo vara** jod **duvara**,
A deljatim učinjeti *kvara*;
Nit' *nađosmo* jod *Bagdata* vrata.

Prod' se vraga, ne udri Bagdata!"

153 Wörter insgesamt
25 C-B Agreements (MAs)
11 A-B Agreements

Die Fassungen A, B und C weisen 11 A-B *Agreements*, 15 C-A *Agreements* und 25 C-B *Agreements* auf. Die C-B *Agreements* entsprechen den synoptischen *Minor Agreements*, insofern es sich um Übereinstimmungen zweier späterer Fassungen gegenüber einer früheren Fassung handelt. Der Anteil von 25 C-B *Agreements* auf rund 100 Wörter im "Sänger von Bagdat" entspricht ziemlich genau dem Anteil von 12 *Minor Agreements* auf 50 Wörter im Senfkornvergleichnis. Auch der Anteil von 11 A-B *Agreements* auf rund 100 Wörter entspricht in etwa dem Anteil von 5 mk-lk *Agreements* auf rund 50 Wörter im Senfkornvergleichnis. Übereinstimmungen zweier Fassungen einer mündlichen Erzählung gegenüber einer dritten Fassung sind in der mündlichen Dichtung ein natürliches und relativ häufiges Phänomen. Und sie weisen sehr große Ähnlichkeiten zu den (*Minor*) *Agreements* in der synoptischen Tripeltradition auf.

3. Eine Analogie aus der Experimentalpsychologie

Eine zweite Analogie zu den synoptischen *Minor Agreements* bieten bestimmte Experimente der Gedächtnispsychologie. F.C. Bartlett (1886-1969), Pionier der experimentellen Gedächtnisforschung, legte seinen Versuchspersonen das nordamerikanische Volksmärchen "The War of the Ghosts" vor, das diese zweimal in gewöhnlichem Tempo durchlasen. Nach 15 Minuten mußte der Text in schriftlicher Form zum ersten Mal reproduziert werden. Weitere Reproduktionen wurden nach Zeitintervallen von wachsender Länge angefertigt⁽¹⁸⁾.

Im Jahre 1971 unterzogen die Psychologen E. Hunt und T. Love einen von ihnen als "VP" bezeichneten Simultanschachspieler einem ähnlichen

⁽¹⁸⁾ *Remembering*. A Study in Experimental and Social Psychology (Cambridge 1967) 63-94 = *The Psychology of Memory*, (eds. P.E. MORRIS – M.A. CONWAY) (The International Library of Critical Writings in Psychology 4; Hants 1993) I, 83-114.

Test. VP, Jahrgang 1935, stammte aus Lettland und besuchte zwischen 1945 und 1950 eine Schule, an der aus Mangel an Büchern und anderen Lehrmitteln großes Gewicht auf reines Auswendiglernen gelegt wurde. So war er nach einem Streitgespräch in der Lage, sich die eigenen und fremden Äußerungen nahezu wörtlich ins Gedächtnis zurückzurufen. Seiner eigenen Einschätzung nach stellte VP unter seinen Altersgenossen, die ein ähnliches Schulsystem durchlaufen hatten wie er, keine Ausnahme dar⁽¹⁹⁾.

In einem der Experimente zur Bestimmung der Gedächtniskapazität VPs, die an der Washingtoner Universität durchgeführt wurden, hatte VP parallel zu zwei Kontrollgruppen eine Erzählung zweimal durchzulesen, anschließend in Siebenersritten rückwärts von 253 bis 0 zu zählen und die Erzählung anschließend nach einer Minute, einer Viertel-, einer halben, einer Dreiviertel- und einer Stunde niederzuschreiben. Weitere Reproduktionen wurden unangekündigt nach sechs Wochen und nach einem Jahr verlangt. Als Textgrundlage wählten Hunt und Love u.a. das erstmals von Bartlett verwendete Volksmärchen vom "Krieg der Geister".

Im Unterschied zu den Gedächtnisleistungen der von Bartlett untersuchten Probanden, in deren Biographie das Auswendiglernen von Texten keine bedeutende Rolle gespielt hatte, konnte VP den Wortlaut des Volksmärchens auch nach einem Jahr noch zu rund 50% reproduzieren. Im folgenden sind die ersten rund 100 Wörter dreier Wiedergaben abgedruckt, die VP nach einer Stunde (Fassung A), nach sechs Wochen (Fassung B) und nach einem Jahr (Fassung C) niederschrieb⁽²⁰⁾. Auch hier sind die positiven *Agreements* durch Fettdruck, Unterstreichung und Kursivdruck hervorgehoben.

Fassung C (nach einem Jahr)	Fassung A (nach einer Stunde)	Fassung B (nach sechs Wochen)
<p>One day two young men from Egliac went down to the river to hunt seals. While there, it suddenly became very foggy and quiet, and <u>they</u> became scared and rowed <u>ashore</u> and <u>hid behind a log</u>. Soon they heard the sound of paddles in the water and <u>canoes</u> approaching.</p>	<p>One <i>night</i> two young men from Egulac went down to the river to hunt seals. While <i>they were</i> there, it became foggy and <i>calm</i>. <u>They</u> came <u>ashore</u> quietly <u>and hid behind a log</u>. Soon they heard <u>canoes</u> approaching and the sound of paddling.</p>	<p>One <i>night</i>, two young men from Egliac went down to the river to hunt seals. While <i>they were</i> there, it became foggy and <i>calm</i>. Soon they heard the sound of paddles approaching, and they thought: "Maybe it's a war party". They fled ashore and hid behind a log.</p>

⁽¹⁹⁾ "How Good Can Memory Be?", *Coding Processes in Human Memory* (eds. A.W. MELTON – E. MARTIN) (Washington 1972) 237-260.

⁽²⁰⁾ Die Texte finden sich bei HUNT – LOVE, "How Good", 258-260, und bei ID., "The Second Mnemonist" (1972), *Memory Observed. Remembering in Natural Contexts* (ed. U. NEISSER) (San Francisco 1982) 390-398, hier 396-398. Für eine ausführliche Dokumentation des gesamten Volksmärchens und eine Analyse der Übereinstimmungen und Abweichung der nach einem Jahr angefertigten Wiedergabe siehe A.D. BAUM, "Experimentalpsychologische Erwägungen zur synoptischen Frage", *BZ* 42 (2000) 37-55.

One of the canoes, with five men in it, paddled ashore and one of the men said:

"What do you think? Let us go up-river and make war against the people".

"I cannot go with you", said one of the young men. "My relatives do not know where I have gone. Besides, I might get killed.

106 Wörter insgesamt
18 C-B Agreements (MAs)
9 C-A Agreements

One canoe with five men in it came ashore and spoke:

"What do you think? We are going up the river to make war on the people. Come with us". One young man said: "We have no arrows". "There are arrows in the boat", said the war party.

"I will not go. I may be killed. My relatives will not know where I have gone.

108 Wörter insgesamt
9 C-A Agreements
8 A-B Agreements

Soon, one of the (unspecified number of) canoes came ashore, with five men in it, and one of them said:

"What do you think? Let us go upriver and make war against the people".

"I will not go", said one of the young men. "I might be killed. My family does not know where I have gone.

105 Wörter insgesamt
18 C-B Agreements (MAs)
8 A-B Agreements

Der Anteil der C-B Agreements im "Krieg der Geister" (18 Agreements auf etwa 100 Wörter) liegt etwas unter dem Wert für den "Sänger von Bagdad" (25 Agreements auf etwa 100 Wörter) und dem Wert für das Senfkorngleichnis (12 Minor Agreements auf etwa 50 Wörter). Der Anteil der A-B Agreements (8 auf etwa 100 Wörter) liegt nur knapp unter dem Wert für die mk-lk Agreements im Senfkorngleichnis (5 Agreements auf rund 50 Wörter). Auch dieses gedächtnispsychologische Experiment belegt: Wörtliche Übereinstimmungen zweier späterer Fassungen gegenüber einer früheren Version desselben Textes sind in Reproduktionen aus dem Gedächtnis ein selbstverständliches Phänomen. Das menschliche Gedächtnis erzeugt sehr ähnliche (Minor) Agreements wie die, die sich in der synoptischen Tripeltradition nachweisen lassen.

*
* *

Der wesentliche Unterschied zwischen den synoptischen Parallelen einerseits und den Parallelversionen aus der Oral Poetry-Forschung und der Experimentalpsychologie andererseits besteht darin, daß diese von einer einzelnen und jene von mehreren Personen stammen⁽²¹⁾. Obwohl sich folglich aus dem herangezogenen Vergleichsmaterial nur Teilanalogien zur synoptischen Frage gewinnen lassen, können diese die Bedeutung eines Faktors unterstreichen, auf dessen Relevanz für die Deutung des synoptischen Befunds und speziell der Minor Agreements immer wieder hingewiesen worden ist. So hat etwa Fee in nachdrücklicher Abgrenzung gegen eine "documentary mentality" betont, für die Beantwortung der synoptischen Frage biete die den Synoptikern gemeinsame mündliche Tradition vielfach

⁽²¹⁾ Für mündliche Parallelfassungen desselben Liedes von verschiedenen Sängern siehe BAUM, "Oral poetry und synoptische Frage", 21-23.

das fehlende Puzzleteil⁽²²⁾. Die aus der mündlichen Dichtung und der experimentellen Gedächtnispsychologie herangezogenen Teilanalogien verleihen diesem Urteil zusätzlichen Nachdruck. Gelegentlich erhobene Einwände gegen den hier vertretenen Ansatz sind entweder sehr unspezifisch⁽²³⁾ oder nachweislich unzutreffend⁽²⁴⁾ und fallen daher angesichts des beigebrachten Materials nicht ins Gewicht. Für die Annahme, ein reines Abschreibeverhältnis zwischen drei Paralleltexten könne die in den Synoptikern anzutreffende Zahl von *Minor Agreements* hervorbringen, dürften dagegen bisher keine außersynoptischen Belege beigebracht worden sein⁽²⁵⁾. Nur durch Einbeziehung des mündlichen Faktors dürfte sich die Entstehung der synoptischen *Minor Agreements* befriedigend klären lassen. Ihre *Minor Agreements* dürften Matthäus und Lukas aus mündlichen Varianten des Markusstoffs geschöpft haben, die in Einzelheiten gegen unser schriftliches Markusevangelium übereinstimmten⁽²⁶⁾.

Leihgesterner Weg 23
D-35625 Hüttenberg

Armin D. BAUM

SUMMARY

The view taken by G.D. Fee and others that oral tradition played a major role in the development of the minor agreements is supported by analogies from oral poetry (M. Parry – A.B. Lord) and cognitive psychology (E. Hunt – T. Love).

⁽²²⁾ FEE, "Text-Critical Look", 23-28: "common oral tradition ... probably is very often the 'fly in the ointment' in resolving the Synoptic problem ... alongside the written documents". Vgl. auch STRECKER, *Minor Agreements*, 18: Es "wird damit zu rechnen sein, daß auch ein mündliches Überlieferungsstadium den synoptischen Stoff einschließlich der *Minor Agreements* mitgestaltet hat".

⁽²³⁾ Dies gilt etwa für ENNULAT, "*Minor Agreements*", 24-25.

⁽²⁴⁾ Dies gilt für die einleitend zitierten Argumente von CROSSAN, *Birth of Christianity*, 52-58.

⁽²⁵⁾ Für schriftliche Analogien siehe A.D. BAUM, "Die lukanische und chronistische Quellenbenutzung im Vergleich: Eine Teilanalogie zum synoptischen Problem", *ETL* 78 (2002) 340-357, einschließlich der dort in Anm. 1 genannten Literatur.

⁽²⁶⁾ Für Analogien zum synoptischen Befund in der Oral Poetry-Forschung siehe weiterhin J.D.G. DUNN, "Jesus in Oral Memory: The Initial Stage of the Jesus Tradition", *SBLASP* 136 (2000) 287-326 = *Jesus. A Colloquium in the Holy Land* (ed. D. DONNELLY) (New York 2001) 84-145, und ID., "Altering the Default Setting: Re-envisioning the Early Transmission of the Jesus Tradition", *NTS* 49 (2003) 139-175.

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

John VAN SETERS, *A Law Book for the Diaspora. Revision in the Study of the Covenant Code*. Oxford, University Press, 2003. xii-236p. 16 × 24. €40.00

Mit dieser Monographie faßt J. Van Seters (Verf.) eine Reihe älterer und bereits veröffentlichter Studien monographisch zusammen, um, wie er beansprucht, eine "Revolution" in der Interpretation des biblischen Rechts zu bewirken und den Nachweis zu führen, daß 1. das "Bundesbuch" (BB), das der Verf. mit Ex 20,23–23,33 abgrenzt, literarisch einheitlich sei und keine literarische Vorgeschichte habe, 2. Teil des Geschichtswerks des "Jahwisten" und von diesem verfaßt worden sei, und 3. das Deuteronomium und Heiligkeitsgesetz in Lev 17–26 voraussetzte und imitiere. Allerdings, sollte auch nur eine dieser Thesen zutreffen, so wären mehr als 100 Jahre der Alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft einer Revolution zum Opfer gefallen.

J. Wellhausen baute auf die Erkenntnisse M.W.L. de Wettes zur Datierung des Deuteronomiums als archimedischen Punkt der Datierung der nichtpriesterlichen und priesterlichen Schichten des Pentateuch auf. Der Verf. kehrt die Logik der Forschungsgeschichte um und wendete sich zunächst den Erzählungen des "Jahwisten" zu und datierte sie spät. Da er in diesem Zuge auch die Methoden der Form-, Traditions-, Überlieferungs- und Redaktionsgeschichte zusammen mit wesentlichen Zügen der Literarkritik erledigt zu haben meint und mit dem "Jahwisten" als historiographischen Autor in Exodus bis Numeri rechnet, der mit DtrH das Deuteronomium voraussetze aber keine literarisch vorgegebenen Quellen integriere, stellte sich ihm im Nachhinein die Frage, wie die Rechtskorpora innerhalb der jahwistischen Erzählungen sich dazu verhalten, mit dem Ergebnis, daß das BB vom Dtn abhängig und von J verfaßt worden sei. Die Analyse der Gesetze wird also der der Erzählungen nachgeordnet und ist nicht wie bei Wellhausen deren Voraussetzung.

Es ist schlicht eine forschungsgeschichtliche Fehlinformation, wenn der Verf. meint, Wellhausen habe das BB aufgrund der Frühdatierung des Elohisten ebenfalls früh angesetzt. Genau die umgekehrte Argumentation ist, wie ein Blick in die "Prolegomena" zeigt, richtig. In einer ideosynchronischen Forschungsgeschichte will der Verf. zeigen, daß die Forscher der letzten einhundert Jahre von Wellhausen über Alt und Noth bis zum Rezensenten Fehlurteilen aufgesessen seien, die nun erstmalig korrigiert werden. Wie nicht anders zu erwarten, gelingt eine derartige "Revolution" nur mit Hilfe eines Zirkelschlusses: die literarische Gestalt und Spätdatierung

eines "Jahwisten", der selbst eine höchst problematische Größe ist, wird vorausgesetzt und das BB in die Sinaierzählung des J. eingepaßt, um erst danach unter der Voraussetzung, daß der J. auch der Autor des BB sei, den Vergleich der Gesetze des BB vornehmlich mit denen in Dtn 12–26 vorzunehmen.

Wie nicht anders zu erwarten beginnt der Verf. also damit, die jahwistische Sinaiperikope als literarischen Kontext des BB vorzustellen. Bereits in der Forschungsgeschichte hat der Verf. schlicht die Studien der Forscher wie N. Lohfink ("Fortschreibung? Zur Technik von Rechtsrevisionen im deuteronomischen Bereich, erörtert an Deuteronomium 12, Ex 21,2-11 und Dtn 15,12-18", *Das Deuteronomium und seine Querbeziehungen* [Hrsg. T. Veijola] [Schriften der finnischen exegetischen Gesellschaft 62; Helsinki 1996] 133-181), B.M. Levinson (*Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation* [New York - Oxford 1997]) und des Rezensenten (E. Otto, *Das Deuteronomium. Politische Theologie und Rechtsreform in Juda und Assyrien* [BZAW 284; Berlin - New York 1999] 203-378), die genau das tun, was der Verf. einfordert, nämlich die Gesetze des Bundesbuches und Deuteronomiums auf das Rezeptionsverhältnis hin zu befragen, übergangen. Gleichermaßen verweigert er, sich mit den Positionen der Analyse der Sinaiperikope auseinanderzusetzen, da es "tedious" sei, die sie mit einem größeren postdtr und postpriesterschriftlichen Anteil an der Sinaiperikope rechnen (u.a. W. Oswald, *Israel am Gottesberg. Eine Untersuchung zur Literargeschichte der vorderen Sinaiperikope Ex 19-24 und deren historischer Hintergrund* [OBO 159; Fribourg - Göttingen] 1998; s. dazu E. Otto, "Forschungen zum nachpriesterschriftlichen Pentateuch", *ThR* 67 [2002] 125-155) und repetiert stattdessen seine Analyse von 1994 (J. Van Seters, *The Life of Moses. The Yahwist as Historian in Exodus - Numbers* [CBETH 10; Kampen 1994] 247-289) mit dem bekannten Ergebnis, daß die nichtpriesterliche Schicht in Ex 19–24 literarisch einheitlich von J verfaßt und von P ergänzt worden sei.

Die Voraussetzung dieser These, daß der Deuteronomiumsrahmen einschließlich Dtn 4–5 literarisch einheitlich dtr sei, muß, was der Verf. nicht zur Kenntnis genommen hat, als überholt gelten, zugunsten der Einsicht in die postdtr Eingriffe in den Deuteronomiumsrahmen, insbesondere in Dtn 4 (E. Otto, *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch. Studien zur Literaturgeschichte von Pentateuch und Hexateuch im Lichte des Deuteronomiumrahmens* [FAT 30; Tübingen 2000]). Soll J das BB in toto verfaßt haben, so muß der Verf. den Nachweis führen, daß auch die Mischpatim von ihm verfaßt seien, Bezüge zum Deuteronomium und Heiligkeitgesetz wie zum Keilschriftrecht aber "Plagiat" seien. Erste Säule der These soll der Nachweis sein, daß die Sklavengesetzgebung in Ex 21,2-6.7-11 die des Deuteronomiums in Dtn 15,12-18 ebenso voraussetzt wie die des Heiligkeitgesetzes in Lev 25,44-46. Ex 21,2-6 handle nicht wie Dtn 15,12-18 von der Schuldklaverei sondern vom Kauf eines hebräischen Sklaven durch einen Ausländer. Die Begründung, die der Verf. für diese These gibt, ist so einfach wie falsch: "Whenever you purchase a Hebrew Slave... The most obvious and direct meaning of this statement is that the person is already a slave for whatever reason and has been purchased from another owner. The terms of the law, however, are such that the seller could not belong to the

Israelite community, because that would be contradictory and make void the law”.

Daß das BB den Ausländer anredet ist unwahrscheinlich. Ich habe dagegen schon vor einigen Jahren eingewandt (E. Otto, „Deuteronomium und Pentateuch“, ZAR 6 [2000] 248), daß Ex 21,2aa performativ zum Ausdruck bringen will, daß durch den Erwerb der Freie zum Schuldklaven wird, zumal von der Apodosis auf die Protasis zurückgeblickt wird. Dem setzt der Verf. (191 Anm. 28) entgegen, „in most instances, it is not the purchase that makes a person a slave”. Was aber sonst soll eine Person zu einem Schuldklaven machen? Vor allem aber Ex 21,3 widerspricht dieser vom Verf. vorgeschlagenen Deutung diametral. Dazu bemerkt er: „This in no way contradicted by the discussion about ‘entering’ single or married, because slaves could be bought as individuals or as family units”. Wenn aber die Frau des Sklaven zusammen mit dem Sklaven gekauft wurde, dann unterscheiden sich ihr Status als Besitz des Herrn nicht von dem der Frau, die dieser dem Sklaven zuführt, nachdem er gekauft wurde. Die Differenzierung zwischen Einzug und Auszug mit und ohne Ehefrau in Ex 21,3f. ist nur unter der Voraussetzung sinnvoll, daß der Sklave die Frau, die er mitbringt, als freier Mann geheiratet hat, sie also ihrem Ehemann in die Schuldklaverei freiwillig folgt und nicht Besitz des Herrn im Gegensatz zu einer Sklavin ist, die der Herr dem Sklaven während seiner Schuldknechtschaft zuführt. Wie in Ex 21,7 geht es auch in Ex 21,2 um den freien Menschen, der in die Schuldklaverei geht. Die Fälle Ex 21,2-6 und Ex 21,7-11 sind zu eng aufeinander bezogen, als daß man sie derart wie der Verf. auseinanderbrechen darf, daß es in Ex 21,7-11 um die freie Israelitin geht, die in die Schuldklaverei verkauft wird, in Ex 21,2-6 dagegen um den bereits versklavten Hebräer, der von einem Ausländer gekauft wird.

Bereits N. Lohfink (a.a.O., 156) hat unmißverständlich, vom Verf. aber übersehen, dazu festgestellt: „Das erste Gesetz in 21,2-6 verlöre seine eigentlich intendierte Aussagekraft, wenn es nicht mit dem zweiten Gesetz 21,7-11 als Einheit gelesen würde”. Der Verf. sieht sein entscheidendes Argument, das alle diejenigen, die in Dtn 15,12-18 eine Fortschreibung oder Revision von Ex 21,2-11 sehen, falsifizieren soll, in deren Unfähigkeit zu erklären, warum in Dtn 15 Ex 21,3-4 nicht rezipiert worden sei. Dem ist aber keineswegs so. Die eherechtliche Regelung in Ex 21,4 wird dtn nicht rezipiert, da sie dem dtn Geschwisterethos diametral widerspricht: Ex 21,4 bedeutet den Verlust des geschwisterlichen Status ohne Zustimmung des Betroffenen und ist entgegen der dtn Redaktionsintention nicht an den Pflichten, sondern den Rechten des Herrn orientiert. Dtn 15,12-18 ist eben nicht „law as a general principle dealing with male and female dept-slaves”, sondern eine Revision von Ex 21,2-11 wie nicht zuletzt N. Lohfink gezeigt hat.

Schließlich soll das BB auch in der Sklavengesetzgebung das Heiligkeitsgesetz in Lev 25,44-46 voraussetzen, das der Verf. gegen die einhellige Exegetenmeinung der letzten Jahre, die die These eines von seinem literarischen Kontext zu isolierenden Heiligkeitsgesetzes zugunsten seiner Einbindung in den Kontext, sei er P oder post-P, aufgegeben hat, als eigenständig ausgegliedert, da P Ergänzung des „Jahwisten” sein soll, dies aber nur um den Preis der ohne Nachweis aufgestellten Behauptung, im Heiligkeitsgesetz sei die Jobelthematik sekundärer Nachtrag. Damit

behauptet der Verf. für das Heiligkeitgesetz eine literarische Mehrschichtigkeit und Isolation vom literarischen Kontext, die er für das BB heftig bekämpft und in bezug auf die Mehrschichtigkeit des Deuteronomiums stillschweigend negiert. Der Verf. bedarf des Heiligkeitgesetzes als Vorlage des "Jahwisten", um das Todesrecht in Ex 21,12-17 sowie die Talionsformel in Ex 21,23-25 als exilisch begründen zu können, da Lev 24,17-20, einer der spätesten Texte im Pentateuch aus dem 4. Jh., Quelle für das exilische BB sein soll.

Ebensowenig überzeugend ist schließlich die Analyse des als zweite Säule der Argumentation des Verf. geltenden Textes in Ex 23,4f. als "Imitation" von Dtn 22,1-4. Die "Feindesliebe" in Ex 23,4f. sei eine Steigerung der Bruderliebe im Deuteronomium. Dagegen spricht, daß sich die Abwandlung von Ex 23,4f. durch Dtn 22,1-4 erklären läßt, der umgekehrte Vorgang aber nicht (s. bereits E. Otto, ZAR 6, 245-247). Dem Gegenargument des Verf., eine Deutung des "Feindes" auf den Prozessgegner widerspreche dem dtn Sprachgebrauch, ist schon die vom Verf. übersehene Monographie von G. Barbiero (*L'asino del nemico. Rinuncia alla vendetta e amore del nemico nella legislazione dell'Antico Testamento* [Es 23,4-5; Dt 22,1-4; Lv 19,17-18] [AnBib 128; Rom 1991] 196) entgegengetreten. Daß Dtn 22,1-4 nicht nur Ex 23,4f. sondern auch Ex 22,6-19 überblickt, ist nicht dadurch abgewiesen, daß es dort um Eigentumsrechte geht und nicht die Begriffe "Feind" oder "Verhaßter" sondern "Nachbar" stehen. Das Argument des Verf. ist hier ohne Funktion. In Dtn 22,1-4 soll ein nur rechtlich zu lösender Eigentumskonflikt in die ethische Norm der Bruderliebe einbezogen werden. Für die Frage der Rezeptionsrichtung entscheidend ist, daß in Dtn 22,1-4 unterschiedliche Textbereiche des BB zusammengeführt werden, Dtn 22,1-4 also das BB voraussetzt und nicht umgekehrt.

Ist die Rezeption des Deuteronomiums im BB vom Verf. nicht plausibel gemacht, so will er seine These noch dadurch stützen, daß er eine direkte literarische Imitation des Codex Hammurapi im Bundesbuch nachweisen will, die nur von einem Autor im Exil, dem J., stammen könne. Ziel der Forschungsgeschichte des Verf. ist die Feststellung, "in practise all of the scholars completely isolate the comparison of the Covenant Code with Near Eastern law from any inner-biblical comparison" (43). Der Rezensent hat sich in zahlreichen Monographien, die der Verf. übersehen hat, genau dieser Aufgabe gestellt (u.a. E. Otto, *Rechtsgeschichte der Redaktionen im Kodex Ešnunna und im "Bundesbuch". Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche und rechtsvergleichende Studie zu altbabylonischen und altisraelitischen Rechtsüberlieferungen* (OBO 85; Fribourg - Göttingen 1989). Der Verf. hätte dort erfahren können, daß der Rechtsvergleich zwischen dem Keilschriftrecht und dem BB erheblich komplexer ist, als die These der Kopie des Kodex Hammurapi (CH) durch J insinuiert. Die nächste Parallele zu Ex 21,35f. ist CE § 53, nicht aber CH §§ 250-252. Wie J im Exil Kenntnis vom Kodex Ešnunna (CE) der altbabylonischen Zeit haben soll, ist offen. Eine direkte literarische Abhängigkeit ist, wie aufgezeigt, vom Verf. aber übersehen, unmöglich (E. Otto, *Körpervletzungen in den Keilschriftrechten und im Alten Testament. Studien zum Rechtstransfer im Alten Orient* [AOAT 226; Neukirchen - Vluyn 1991] 147-164).

Die Erklärung der Parallelen zwischen dem Keilschriftrecht und den

Mischpatim kann also nicht allein in einer literarischen Abhängigkeit des J vom Kodex Hammurapi gesehen werden, zumal der Verf. auch einen direkten Einfluß der Mittelassyrischen Gesetze (MAG) auf Ex 22,15f. (s. dazu E. Otto, "Körperverletzung oder Verletzung von Besitzrechten? Zur Redaktion von Ex 22,15f. im Bundesbuch und §§ 55;56 im Mittelassyrischen Kodex der Tafel A", ZAW 105 [1993] 153-165) und Dtn 22,28f. einräumt, diesen Einfluß aber nur um seiner Gesamtthese willen exilisch datiert. Wie aber soll in spätbabylonischer Zeit mittelassyrisches Recht, für das es babylonisch keine Parallele gibt, rezipiert worden sein? Die These, J "had direct access to some Babylonien law codes and could read and imitate them for his own code" (173), ist keine Lösung der komplexen Probleme des Rechtstransfers im Alten Orient, wenn von drei Rechtssammlungen mit Parallelen im BB zwei, der aus dem frühen 2. Jt. stammende CE und die MAG im spätbabylonischen Babylonien nicht tradiert wurden. Occam's razor sollte weder in der Pentateuchforschung noch in der der altorientalischen und biblischen Rechtsgeschichte das einzige exegetische Werkzeug sein. Die Umkehrung des Überlieferungsgeschichtlichen Verhältnisses zwischen Bundesbuch und Deuteronomium durch den Verf. ist Konsequenz einer Pentateuchhypothese, die bei der Genesis ansetzend sich nicht um die Rechtskorpora von Bundesbuch, Deuteronomium und Heiligkeitgesetz kümmert, um dann im Nachhinein, wenn die These an den erzählenden Parten zunächst der Genesis und dann erst der übrigen Bücher des Tetrateuch, ohne sich um die Literaturgeschichte des Deuteronomiums zu kümmern, entwickelt worden ist, die Richtung des literarischen Abhängigkeitsverhältnisses zwischen den Rechtssammlungen zu dekretieren, erneut ohne sich um die exegetischen Probleme von Deuteronomium und Heiligkeitgesetz zu kümmern.

Ergebnis ist die These, daß das Bundesbuch niemals eigenständig war, sondern aus einem Guß von dem vorausgesetzten "Jahwisten" verfaßt wurde. Wenn aber J, wie der Verf. unkritisch meint, als Imitator vorgegebener Literatur literarische Spannungen formal und inhaltlich inkonsistenter Texte wie im Bundesbuch selbst geschaffen haben soll, fragt sich, warum der Verf. überhaupt noch literarkritisch im Pentateuch J ausgrenzt und nicht vorkritisch mit nur einem Verfasser des gesamten Pentateuch rechnet. Das Verhältnis der Rechtskorpora im Pentateuch ist nicht das von Imitation und Plagiat, sondern schriftgelehrter Fortschreibung und Revision autoritativer Rechtsliteratur, die auf den Gott Israels als Rechtsquelle zurückgeführt und in gewandelter historischer Situation ausgelegt werden muß. Es dürfte deutlich sein, daß sich J. Van Seters' Pentateuchhypothese spätestens angesichts der literarischen Komplexität der Rechtskorpora von BB, Deuteronomium und Heiligkeitgesetz als zu grobschlächtig und ungeeignet, den komplexen Prozeß der literarischen Genese des Pentateuch zu erfassen, erweist. Die vom Verf. angekündigte "Revolution" der biblischen Rechtsgeschichte findet so nicht statt.

Universität München
 Evangelisch-Theologische Fakultät
 Lehrstuhl für Alttestamentliche Theologie
 Schellingstr. 3 (VG)
 D-80799 München

Eckart OTTO

Annette SCHELLENBERG, *Erkenntnis als Problem*. Qohelet und die alttestamentliche Diskussion um das menschliche Erkennen (OBO 188). Freiburg Schweiz, Universitätsverlag – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002. xii-333 p. 16 × 23,5

The object of this monograph, a doctoral dissertation accepted by the University of Zürich, is the Old Testament discussion about the problem of the realisation and the limit of human knowledge. Since Qoh raises this problem more extensively than any other biblical book, it is treated first and foremost; but also all other texts which deal with knowledge as a problem, receive a shorter, albeit still honorable treatment. The first chapter is an introduction which presents a *status quaestionis*, some terminological elucidations about knowledge in the OT, and the presentation of the question, method and concrete approach in this study. Faced with this introduction the reader already feels that this is a well-considered and cautious work. From the survey of former research it appears that the topic of knowledge in the OT has been neglected, and comparing the biblical formulation of the problem with ancient philosophy, the author rightly concludes that the biblical treatment is not *erkenntnistheoretisch* but *erkenntnisdiskutierend*. Not the nature of knowledge, but its sources and limits are the point of interest in this study. In her presentation of the polyphony of texts in which knowledge is discussed as a problem, the author distinguishes six contributions to the debate, each of which has its own profile: Qohelet, the Job literature, the contribution of “theologised” wisdom, Gen 2–3 and related texts, the prophetic and, finally, the apocalyptic contribution.

Qoh’s contribution to the problem is entitled “Gottgewirkte Begrenztheit menschlicher Erkenntnisfähigkeit”, and its study takes up the whole of Chapter 2 (35-200); whereas the analysis of the contributions of other books and traditions (Chapter 3) is limited to pages 201-290. Chapter 2 begins with a short introduction to Qoh’s position with respect to the problem of knowledge. It contains sections on the time and historical context of Qoh, in which S. does not diverge from the *communis opinio* of our days, i.e. Qoh was written in the Ptolemaic period (second half of the 3rd century B.C.). She takes no position in the debate on a possible influence of Greek literature and thought on Qoh. The importance of the topic of knowledge in Qoh is obvious, in view of the high frequency of words belonging to that field, such as רָאָה (47x), יָדַע (36x), בָּרַר, “sift, test”, and הִשְׁבִּין, “conclusion, *Denkergebnis*”. Qoh often expresses his personal approach and he argues, thus taking up a critical position towards tradition. S. also offers a survey of earlier research on the questions of whether Qoh is a sceptic and an empiricist in which she shows that Qoh’s epistemology has been designated in different, often even contradictory, ways. The two questions should not be taken as alternatives, but they have both been answered negatively and positively in the past. The author rightly prefers not to start from these categories in analysing Qoh’s views, but rather first to analyse the texts and, in a second step, to compare their views with known epistemological currents. Therefore Qoh’s explicit statements on knowledge constitute the starting point of her analysis.

The first major part of Chapter 2 deals with the limits of knowledge, or

Qoh's "sceptical" side. The first limit is death: a distinction between wisdom and folly is significant in the domain of life but meaningless in the domain of death (Qoh 2,12-17). Wisdom has a certain advantage over folly, namely a better perceptivity and knowledge, but this advantage is limited to the domain of life (2,18-21). A major difference between living and dead consists in having or not having access to knowledge (9,4-6), for in Sheol there is no knowledge or wisdom (9,10b). The future also appears to be a limit to human knowledge. Thus in our terrestrial world it is possible to speak about death, but we cannot make statements about what is beyond this terrestrial domain (3,21-22), for a human being cannot know what is good for the coming days of life, nor what will happen "under the sun" after him (6,10-12). Of what is "after him" he can understand nothing (7,13-14); he does not know it because nobody can tell him when or how coming things will happen (8,5-8). Time and chance happen to everybody, but a human being does not know that time (9,11-12), and much talk does not increase one's knowledge about the future (10,12-15). Qoh accepts that a general knowledge about the future exists, but he is sceptical about the possibility of right and correct statements on the future. A third limit to knowledge is "God's acting". Humans cannot grasp God's work "from the beginning to the end" (Qoh 3,10-11). The most explicit expression of this idea is found in Qoh 8,16-17, esp. v. 17: "and I saw (וַרְאִיתִי) all the work of God (אֶת־כָּל־מַעֲשֵׂה הָאֱלֹהִים): Man (הָאָדָם) cannot grasp (לִמְצוֹא) the work that is done under the sun (אֶת־הַמַּעֲשֵׂה אֲשֶׁר נַעֲשֶׂה תַּחַת־הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ) (בְּשֶׁל אִשֶּׁר) man may toil (עָמַל) in seeking (לִבְקֹשׁ), he cannot grasp <it>. Even when the sage claims to understand (לִדְעוֹת) <it>, he cannot grasp (לִמְצוֹא) <it>". Again in 11,5 God's work is mentioned as the object of human ignorance: in the pericope 11,1-6, some examples of limited human knowledge are given; however, these limits are not to be regarded as a deficit, rather they are connected with God's own doing. Already in his first chapter, Qoh, in his role of king, encounters the problem of human efforts to obtain knowledge which do not achieve their aim (Qoh 1,13-15) and he expands on it (vv. 16-18). And in 2,22-26 he reaches the conclusion that in the end it is not the human being who is responsible for the success of these efforts, but it is God who decides on their success or failure. In the conclusion to this part of the monograph S. states that for Qoh, "God's work" signifies more than the act of creation at the beginning – God's doing defines what happens now. This means that God himself also limits human knowledge, but S. overdoes things when she sees the most explicit expression of this tenet in 8,16-17. A few lines back, I rendered her translation of v. 17 into English, and if I understand her well, she means: "and I saw that it is the work of God that man cannot grasp the work that is done under the sun...". Otherwise, her assertion about the most explicit expression would make no sense. But this translation is highly doubtful and, in my opinion, Qoh would never assert that all (כָּל) of God's work consists in rendering man unable to grasp what happens under the sun. This verse clearly expresses that God's work has to do with the facts of human life, as is very well stated by Whybray in his comment on 8,17: "It is important to note that Qoh here equates *the work of God* with *the work that is done under the sun*. God controls the events of human history" (R.N. Whybray, *Ecclesiastes* [New Century Bible Commentary; London 1989] 139). We find similar explanations in the commentaries by N. Lohfink, A. Lauha and J.A. Loader. I do not

think that Qoh explicitly says that “God’s work” is the cause of the limited character of human knowledge, though he could say it as a logical consequence of his thesis that God ordains or controls everything. On the other hand, S. is right in stating that “God’s work” as the object of knowledge is a limit, since it is far beyond human comprehension. In other words, for Qoh the limitation of human knowledge is one of the anthropological basics.

Chapter 2. § 3 treats the sources of knowledge, or Qoh’s “empirical” side. Qoh is not very explicit about this topic, but there are sufficient implicit hints to help us in drawing a relatively clear picture. Experience is an essential part of cognition. Unlike other wisdom books in the Bible, Qoh uses the first person singular very often, and in the great majority of instances with verbs that are connected with the cognition process (*Erkenntnisgewinnung*). S. then studies the different forms of argumentation in Qoh: observation with free reflection (*Beobachtung mit freier Reflexion*; ex. Qoh 4,1-3); induction (ex. Qoh 1,13-15); and falsification (ex. Qoh 7,15-18). Qoh’s use of words is also analysed: ראיה, שמע, ידע, אומר and דבר pi., as well as a few less frequent words and expressions. This chapter concludes with a few pages on the idea of creationism (*Schöpfungsdenken*) as a second source of knowledge. This means that Qoh takes part of his knowledge from this formative idea, which he does not argue. It is what we could call an axiom. S. concludes Chapter 2 with two fundamental statements, which summarize the main result of her research: “Obwohl sich auch bei ihm [Qoh] einige unreflektiert vorausgesetzte Vorstellungen finden, sind es in erster Linie seine expliziten Reflexionen über das menschliche Erkennen und seine Grenzen, die den Charakter des Buchs prägen” (199). And: “Gerade weil der Mensch so vieles nicht erkennen und daher auch nicht vorausberechnen kann, gilt es, sich auf das Jetzt zu konzentrieren und das Leben im Moment zu gestalten und zu genießen” (199-200).

Though the intensity of Qoh’s discussion about the epistemological question is unusual in Ancient Near Eastern Literature, it has nevertheless a number of links with other, mainly sapiential, books. S. first discusses Job, which shows the same sceptical outline as Qoh albeit subordinate to Job’s theodicy problem. Then she addresses the so-called “theologised” wisdom in Prov 1–9, Sir and Wis, where, in general, human cognitive capacity is considered positively; where sometimes the authors try to save the *Tun-Ergehen-Zusammenhang* in spite of experiences to the contrary, and where, as sources of knowledge, the triad of experience, tradition and revelation comes to the fore. And then she turns to Gen 1–2 and related texts (the Atramhasis myth, the Adapa myth, Gilgamesh, Ethiopian Henoch), which show the ambivalence of human cognitive capacity: human knowledge is described very optimistically as a possibility of a great independence for humanity, which, however, involves the possibility of wicked acts. Next S. deals with knowledge of the people as eschatological hope: in other words, the prophetic contribution. She concentrates on the book of Isaiah, in which the epistemological problem is posed exclusively in terms of the theological question of “knowing God”. Hosea, Jeremia, Ezekiel, and the narratives of the Elijah and Elisha Cycle are touched upon only briefly. In prophetic literature, the question focuses mainly on the problem of failing to be aware of God, which is a situation to be overcome; whereas in Qoh, limited knowledge

about God is a lasting human situation. Finally, she considers the apocalyptic approach (Daniel, Ez 40–48, Henoch, 4 Ezra) which sees broad knowledge, including a look into the distant future, as a way out of the current crisis.

Hopefully, this summary gives a correct idea of the richness of this monograph's content. But the way it has been made, and especially the methodological meticulousness of the exegesis of Qoheleth are also exemplary. I can only have some minor objections or doubts on details. For instance, in my opinion, in Qoh 2,22-26 the limit of knowledge is not the point (67-68). The interpretation of כִּי in 2,14 as an adversative particle is preferable to the somewhat intricate approach of S, for as well as a falsification, a strong relativisation of vv. 13-14a is served by an adversative (80). The rhetorical question מִי יֵדַע in 2,19a does not show that the king assumes that nobody can have the necessary knowledge; it only expresses his doubt (86). I do not see that in 7,17, unlike v. 16, there is a warning not to give up the truth expressed in the *Tun-Ergehen-Zusammenhang* too rashly (178). Neither do I see the necessity to stress that in 1,13-15, the king draws the conclusion that "All is *hebel* and striving after wind" from his own perspective only (188-189).

In conclusion, Schellenberg has produced an exemplary work and is worthy of our gratitude and congratulations.

Dunberg 50
B-3210 Lubbeek

Antoon SCHOORS

Bernard RENAUD, *Nouvelle ou éternelle Alliance? Le message des prophètes* (LD 189). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2002. 378 p. 13,5 × 21,5. €38,00.

Il tema dell'alleanza nuova annunciata dai profeti costituisce un elemento di grande rilievo per la comprensione teologica dell'Antico Testamento, soprattutto nel suo collegamento con la letteratura neotestamentaria. Se la prima alleanza è stata oggetto di numerosi e importanti studi, volti a studiarne i vari aspetti letterari e istituzionali (di cui rende conto l'opera di E.W. Nicholson, *God and His People. Covenant and Theology in the Old Testament*, Oxford 1986), il motivo dell'alleanza promessa non è stato trattato se non in brevi articoli, oppure in qualche capitoletto di Teologia Biblica dal carattere necessariamente sommario. Il contributo di Renaud viene a colmare quindi una lacuna degli studi biblici, anche se l'apporto si colloca più sul versante dell'esegesi di testi che su quello di una sintesi teologica.

Secondo le dichiarazioni programmatiche dell'autore (11), oggetto specifico di questa monografia è una più adeguata comprensione delle parole attribuite a Gesù: "Questo calice è la nuova alleanza nel mio sangue" (1 Cor 11,25; Lc 22,20). A questo scopo vengono studiati i testi del *corpus* profetico che costituirebbero il fondamento della suddetta tradizione neotestamentaria. Questa prospettiva di teologia biblica non è in realtà esplicitata nello sviluppo esegetico assunto dall'opera in questione; vi si

accenna solo in fase conclusiva (337-341), senza tuttavia un nesso organico con le pagine precedenti. D'altra parte, per un adeguato trattamento di una tale problematica sarebbe stato necessario ampliare l'orizzonte alle dimensioni sacrificali dell'alleanza, sia nell'Antico sia nel Nuovo Testamento, sulla base di una considerazione ampia degli elementi di natura simbolica in cui l'alleanza si esprime.

L'autore si limita dunque a studiare dettagliatamente solo alcuni testi profetici, distribuendo il materiale in capitoli omogenei quanto a paternità letteraria, secondo una discutibile sequenza cronologica, e precisamente Ger 31,31-34 (che, a differenza di quanto pensano molti commentatori, è da Renaud ascritto a Geremia stesso); Ger 32,36-41 e 50,4-5 (attribuiti ai discepoli di Geremia); Ez 16,59-63; 34,25-30 e 37,26-28 (dei discepoli di Ezechiele); Is 54,1-10 e 55,1-5 (del Deutero-Isaia); a parte vengono esaminati poi alcuni passi tratti dai Canti del Servo (Is 42,1-7 e 49,1-9) e due versetti del Trito-Isaia (Is 59,21 e 61,8); un ultimo capitolo, prima delle brevi pagine di conclusione, è infine consacrato alle attestazioni più tardive (Os 2,20 e Bar 2,35).

Lo studio dei vari testi viene condotto seguendo le tradizionali operazioni esegetiche: delimitazione della pericope, annotazioni di carattere testuale, struttura letteraria della unità, commento versetto per versetto, conclusione teologica. Utile per il lettore che intende confrontarsi con l'uno o l'altro dei passi analizzati, questo modo di procedere risulta meno gradito a chi, interessato all'intero percorso, deve subire digressioni e ripetizioni, senza percepire un reale progresso dimostrativo. Non siamo infatti riusciti a cogliere quale sia esattamente la proposta interpretativa globale dell'intera monografia, e non abbiamo potuto attingerne la novità contenutistica rispetto ai contributi di precedenti autori.

Problematico è il duplice criterio adottato per la selezione dei brani analizzati: vengono considerati solo quelli che parlano di una alleanza "futura", oggetto quindi di promessa da parte del Signore, e solo quelli in cui tale realtà è esplicitamente definita con i termini di "alleanza nuova" (*b'rît ḥādāšā*), "alleanza eterna" (*b'rît 'ôlām*), "alleanza di pace" (*b'rît šālôm*). Perlomeno discutibile ci appare l'equivalenza sinonimica stabilita fra queste locuzioni (75-76); d'altra parte, è chiaro che in ebraico si può esprimere il concetto di novità (e di eternità) ricorrendo a diversi moduli linguistici. Fin dall'inizio va allora fatta emergere la domanda sulla pertinenza metodologica di una tale impostazione di studio. Se l'argomento che si intende studiare è il *tema* biblico della alleanza nuova, è chiaro che non ci si possa limitare solo alle occorrenze in cui appare il *termine* tecnico di *b'rît ḥādāšā* o i suoi equivalenti, perché in molti altri testi i profeti espongono la stessa idea utilizzando un diverso vocabolario (affine o complementare). Sarebbe del tutto incongruo, ad esempio, trattare il tema del "pastore" nella Bibbia limitandosi alle citazioni in cui appare il termine ebraico *rō'eh* o il greco *poimēn*, tralasciando le pagine dove si parla di pecore, di ovile, di pascoli, ecc. Analogamente, non può essere accettato come procedere rigoroso il prescindere dai passi dove la realtà dell'alleanza è chiaramente evocata, per mezzo della "formula" che indica la reciproca appartenenza (del tipo: "Io YHWH sarò il loro Dio ed essi saranno il mio popolo"), oppure mediante l'uso di termini o temi assolutamente tipici.

Analizzando il passo di Ger 31,31-34, che per Renaud costituisce l'oracolo di riferimento per i successivi annunci profetici, si vedono apparire alcuni tratti caratteristici della nuova alleanza, in opposizione a quella antica. Uno di questi è l'iscrizione della Legge di Dio nel cuore (v. 33), un altro è la conoscenza del Signore da parte di tutto il popolo (v. 34a), un altro ancora è il perdono dei peccati (v. 34b). Ora, ognuno di questi tratti è di fatto capace di suggerire, anche isolatamente, l'evento globale che i profeti intendono annunciare (come si ricava, ad esempio, da Ez 16,59-63 che condensa tutto il messaggio nella promessa del perdono). Risulta perciò strano che il nostro autore non consideri essenziali al tema della nuova alleanza dei passi, come quello di Ez 36,22-36 dove è tematizzato in modo esplicito il dono di un cuore nuovo (v. 26), quale condizione di una rinnovata relazione tra YHWH e il suo popolo (v. 28), oppure il brano di Ger 24,4-7 dove Dio dice: "darò loro un cuore capace di conoscermi, perché io sono il Signore; essi saranno il mio popolo e io sarò il loro Dio" (v. 7). Egli vi riconosce una certa somiglianza con Ger 31,31-34 (58), ma poiché manca la locuzione di "alleanza nuova" o "alleanza eterna" tali testi sono oggetto di una considerazione solo marginale.

Dal passo di Ger 31,31-34, ma anche da quasi tutti gli altri testi studiati da Renaud, si vede chiaramente che i profeti, per parlare della nuova alleanza, ricorrono a diverse immagini, e giustappongono elementi contenutistici di vario genere, nell'intento di descrivere un fenomeno di natura complessa. In alcuni oracoli troviamo un'insistenza sulla dimensione interiore dell'uomo, in altri invece si sviluppa piuttosto la ricostruzione delle componenti socio-politiche (come la promessa del re davidico in Ez 34,23-24); ciò che comunque prevale è l'accostamento, talvolta sorprendente, di tratti anche disparati, come se la perfezione dell'evento annunciato non potesse essere illustrata se non ricorrendo a molteplici figure. Ciò è riconosciuto da Renaud (cfr. 236), ma nell'insieme dell'opera in esame non viene sviluppato coerentemente quale principio euristico e quale prospettiva teologica.

Troviamo dunque inadeguato che lo studio della nuova alleanza venga limitato ai pochi versetti scelti dal nostro autore, così come impropria è la sottolineatura esclusiva della trasformazione interiore dell'uomo, che si dovrebbe ritenere normativa a partire dal testo fondatore di Ger 31,31-34. Non è legittimo isolare un elemento dagli altri senza snaturare il messaggio profetico. A questo proposito va introdotta la questione capitale del *contesto* pertinente. Tutti ammetteranno che il passo di Geremia ora citato costituisca un'unità letteraria dotata di relativa autonomia; ma tutti devono anche riconoscere che quei versetti sono inseriti nel contesto omogeneo dei capitoli 30-31, contesto essenziale per la adeguata comprensione di quell'oracolo come di ognuna delle pericopi ivi inserite. Dedurre, in base a un solo tassello, quale sia la natura del tutto è una operazione fuorviante. Così affermare, in base ai soli versetti 33-34 del capitolo 31 di Geremia, che caratteristico della nuova alleanza è di essere "unilaterale", cioè opera esclusiva del Signore senza partecipazione di Israele, è dimenticare quanto è detto nel testo profetico immediatamente precedente, e cioè che le lacrime di Rachele, personificazione del popolo, avranno la loro ricompensa (31,16).

Un tale genere di considerazione non si limita ovviamente al solo pas-

so di Ger 31,31-34, ma investe l'insieme dei testi analizzati; una vera sintesi teologica — che sappiamo essere difficile — per descrivere l'evento della nuova alleanza, deve saper articolare aspetti non immediatamente compatibili, come la dimensione interiore dell'uomo e la realtà esteriore, come la assoluta gratuità dell'azione creatrice di Dio e l'indispensabile partecipazione dell'uomo al processo salvifico. La radicale opposizione tra la prima alleanza (definita bilaterale, con un carattere di legge imposta al partner umano) e la nuova alleanza (che sarebbe unilaterale e senza condizioni) appare non rispettosa dell'insieme dei testi biblici, e soprattutto non risulta adeguata alla natura della realtà che si intende presentare.

Ci sia consentito, alla fine, notare che un indice di tutte le citazioni bibliche (359-371) non è di grande utilità; basterebbe segnalare i passi sui quali l'autore fornisce un qualche contributo esegetico. Si sente la mancanza invece di un indice dei motivi teologici più importanti riguardanti la nozione specifica di nuova alleanza; in una trattazione dal carattere analitico un tale repertorio avrebbe rappresentato uno strumento proficuo per il reperimento dei temi più ricorrenti.

Pontificio Istituto Biblico
Via della Pilotta, 25
I - 00187 Roma

Pietro BOVATI

Novum Testamentum

Jenny READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Bezan Text of Acts. A Contribution of Discourse Analysis to Textual Criticism* (JSNTSS 236), London, Sheffield Academic Press, 2002. xii + 380 p. 16 × 24. € 75.00.

Desde hace algunos años asistimos a un fuerte debate sobre los problemas textuales de los Hechos de los Apóstoles. La autora ha colaborado con sus artículos, y ahora con este libro, a esclarecer uno de los temas más debatidos, el doble texto, centrándose principalmente en el texto transmitido por el códice de Beza.

La obra de JR-H consta de dos partes, la primera contiene dos capítulos, uno sobre los manuscritos y los tipos de texto de los Hechos y otro sobre el análisis del discurso. Ambos capítulos sirven de marco al estudio que se desarrolla en la segunda parte. En un lenguaje sencillo y preciso, propio de la alta pedagogía, la autora presenta las dos tradiciones textuales de los Hechos, la occidental y la alejandrina, proporciona datos cuantitativos, repartidos porcentualmente según se trate de adiciones, lecturas alternativas, orden de palabras u omisiones. Para comparar las dos tradiciones ha tomado manuscritos concretos, el códice de Beza para la primera y el Sinaítico y el

Vaticano para la segunda, con el fin de evitar una excesiva dispersión de los datos a la hora de clasificarlos.

En el capítulo referente al análisis del discurso, JR-H define los principios metodológicos y los conceptos analíticos; estudia principalmente los rasgos formales del lenguaje en interdependencia con el mundo real en el que ese lenguaje ha sido significativo y vía de comunicación. Bajo este aspecto la intencionalidad del editor desempeña un papel prominente. Idea básica que recorre toda la obra y se expresa del siguiente modo en las conclusiones generales: "... the language generally appears to be being used in the same way in both texts; it looks as if it is difference in the narrator's purpose, his point of view and, not least, his relationship with his audience, rather than difference in the usage of Greek, that gives rise to variant readings" (347).

La segunda parte constituye el tema principal del libro, el análisis lingüístico. Cada capítulo responde a una categoría, según el tipo de variación: el orden de palabras, el uso del artículo, las denominaciones del Espíritu Santo, las preposiciones, los nexos, los títulos de Jesús, el uso de $\acute{\omicron}$ $\kappa\upsilon\pi\tau\omicron\varsigma$ y $\acute{\omicron}$ $\theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, y las dos formas, helenística y hebrea, con que se nombra a Jerusalén. De todas se hace un análisis exhaustivo desde distintos puntos de vista, según la naturaleza de cada categoría. Especialmente interesantes resultan los análisis del orden de palabras (capítulo 3) y de los nexos (capítulo 7). La autora acepta con ciertas reservas que estos fenómenos se expliquen por influencia de otras lenguas en contacto o por otros motivos externos al significado del texto; considera que la causa de la transformación del lenguaje reside más bien en la intención del que habla y en los elementos internos al discurso. Al tratar cada uno de los temas mencionados, se estudian las formas adoptadas en el texto común a las dos tradiciones y las variaciones que se encuentran en el texto divergente; el análisis revela qué líneas de pensamiento, qué posiciones sociales y qué intereses teológicos sirven de fondo a cada tradición textual. Al mismo tiempo y a través de sus rasgos léxicos y estilísticos, se va definiendo el carácter de las líneas editoriales.

La autora ha manejado acertadamente la complejidad de los datos manteniendo la orientación de su discurso por medio de epígrafes frecuentes y de tablas representativas. Cabe pensar que el trabajo de fondo que precede a esta — y a toda — síntesis, no haya sido mayor que el de adoptar una formulación para hacerlo asequible. Un efecto favorable de esa formulación es que la autora contrasta las opiniones propias y ajenas con un tono personal que infunde en el lector deseos de participar activamente en el debate.

En su análisis comparativo JR-H rompe con la idea algo simplista de que un texto expansivo es producto de la labor editorial de los escribas; concretamente el código de Beza se presenta como obra de autor, con cohesión en léxico y estilo y con una intencionalidad teológica. Este fondo teológico es un punto que marca diferencias entre las dos tradiciones de los Hechos: en términos generales, mientras en el texto alejandrino los apóstoles parecen haber captado plenamente la función mesiánica de Jesús, en el texto de Beza este hecho se pone en duda; Pablo y los once han comprendido, aunque no todos de la misma forma, que Jesús es el Mesías de Israel según las Escrituras, pero no saben hasta qué punto su mensaje va más allá de las doctrinas judías. El texto del código busca transmitir una verdad teológica utilizando un marco histórico; el alejandrino, en cambio, transmite un hecho

histórico, si bien matizado con tintes apologéticos, biográficos o, también, teológicos (22-25). Conviene asimismo destacar que en el texto de Beza no se atacan las prácticas judías desde una posición de hostilidad externa, desde los gentiles, sino desde dentro, como lo hicieron los profetas, y ese judaísmo inherente al código lo aproxima en el tiempo a los comienzos de la evangelización cristiana.

No es discutible el enfoque del trabajo ni su propia metodología; sin embargo, causan cierto malestar algunos pasos que requieren un salto mental en la coherencia del razonamiento. En mi opinión, la metodología del análisis del discurso no se compagina con la de la crítica del texto y, aunque en este trabajo se ha conseguido una cierta imbricación de ambas, el análisis del discurso parece ir demasiado lejos en lo que se refiere a la historia de la transmisión textual. En el capítulo 11 (conclusiones generales) la autora nos transmite su percepción del texto — de los textos — de los Hechos de un modo convincente; sin embargo, el lector ha ido comprobando a lo largo de la obra que las formas y los esquemas lingüísticos fluctúan y que las dificultades para elaborar un criterio textual consistente son grandes. Entonces aparece la duda: ¿puede deducirse del análisis del discurso una afirmación fiable sobre la historia del texto? ¿puede la crítica literaria establecer principios de crítica textual? La autora así lo cree: las variaciones de un texto parten principalmente de la conexión emisor-receptor; por lo tanto, del análisis del discurso se deduce que la intención del o los emisores, por un lado, y los diferentes grupos receptores, por otro, pueden motivar distintas líneas editoriales. Si este análisis se enfoca hacia la forma en que se presenta el texto, — siempre en opinión de la autora —, se configura un elemento válido para ponderar las variantes (42-44). La evaluación textual que JR-H hace de los Hechos, anteponiendo el texto occidental al alejandrino, resulta aceptable porque su percepción del texto y los resultados de su análisis lo hacen verosímil. Aunque los elementos subjetivos que intervienen en el análisis del discurso empañan el procedimiento, hemos de tener en cuenta que, en la práctica, tampoco en la crítica textual se aplican regularmente criterios objetivos. Creo, pues, que además de la intención del editor plasmada en una determinada forma literaria, y de los demás elementos socioculturales presentes en el contexto, en cada variación ha de tenerse en cuenta la realidad del proceso de transmisión, donde el lenguaje y el estilo también experimentan transformación. En mi opinión, para elaborar criterios textuales hemos de recurrir a métodos distintos y complementarios al análisis del discurso.

Es de mayor mérito la contribución de esta obra a la comprensión del texto de los Hechos y a la exégesis rigurosa de su contenido. Asimismo considero *felicitous* haber puesto en lugar preeminente el texto del código de Beza, como ya lo hicieron A.C. Clark, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Oxford 1933) y E. Delebecque, *Les deux Actes des Apôtres* (Études Bibliques Nouvelle série 6; París 1986) y más recientemente D.C. Parker, *Codex Bezae. An Early Chistian Manuscript and its Text* (Cambridge 1992). Constituye una excelente revisión de los problemas histórico-teológicos y críticos planteados por la doble tradición textual de los Hechos.

Termina esta obra con una bibliografía específica muy sugerente y dos índices, el de referencias bíblicas y el de autores. No es asunto de menor importancia la perfección editorial con que JR-H nos presenta una obra tan

compleja; tanto la expresión como la forma tipográfica son, sin duda, el reflejo del rigor que apreciamos en sus trabajos. Entre las erratas, de cuya presencia parece imposible prescindir, sólo puedo señalar dos: *al la misión* (22, n. 12, debe ser *a la misión*) y que *is* debe suprimirse en 352, l. 4.

JR-H nos anuncia la publicación del comentario textual y exegético de los Hechos de los Apóstoles, como resultado final de su análisis. Proyecto en colaboración con Josep Rius-Camps, que completará la obra de este autor ya publicada *Comentari als Fets dels Apòstols* (Barcelona 1991-2000).

Instituto de Filología del CSIC
Duque de Medinaceli, 6
E-28014 Madrid

M^a V. SPOTTORNO

Allan R. BEVERE, *Sharing in the Inheritance. Identity and the Moral Life in Colossians* (JSNTSS 226). London, Sheffield Academic Press, 2003. x-294 p. 16 × 24. €60.00

Esta monografía, versión revisada de la tesis de doctorado defendida en 1998 en la Universidad de Durham (Reino Unido), aborda el viejo problema de la “filosofía de Colosas” de una manera original, ya que, por una parte, aplica al estudio de Colosenses los planteamientos de la llamada “new perspective on Paul” y, por otra, centra su atención en la parte parenética de la carta, convencido de que en ella se pueden encontrar las claves para descubrir la situación específica a la que hace referencia el escrito. Estos dos puntos – aplicación de la “new perspective” y valoración del material parenético – constituyen los ejes de la investigación de Bevere y determinan la estructura de su trabajo: después del capítulo 1 (“Introduction”), en el que justifica sus presupuestos y opciones metodológicas, los capítulos 2 (“The Badges of Identity: Parallels Between Galatians and Colossians”) y 3 (“The Israel Motif”) buscan justificar la pertinencia de aplicar a Colosenses los planteamientos que la “new perspective” ha utilizado para interpretar las cartas auténticas, especialmente Gálatas y Romanos; los restantes capítulos están dedicados a realizar una cuidadosa y detallada exégesis de la parte parenética de la carta, dividida en tres secciones: “The Background of Colossians 3.1-4 and its Integration” (capítulo 4), “Vices and Virtues: 3.5-17” (capítulo 5), “The Colossian *Haustafel*: 3.18-4.1” (capítulo 6); finalmente, el capítulo 7 (“Conclusion”) resume brevemente el resultado de la investigación y la tesis defendida por el autor: que la “filosofía” combatida por Colosenses se identifica con la posición de los judíos de la ciudad, que negaban que los cristianos de origen gentil tuvieran parte en la herencia de Israel y, en definitiva, en la salvación de Dios.

En las primeras secciones del capítulo 1 (“Introduction”) Bevere hace una rápida presentación de la “new perspective on Paul”, remitiendo a los trabajos de otros investigadores, particularmente de N. Wright, J.D.G. Dunn y J. Barclay. Puesto que no aborda propiamente la discusión de la “new perspective”, entrar en su valoración desbordaría también el objeto de estas

líneas. Baste, por ello, con dejar constancia de que la tesis de que Col tiene como tema central el de la identidad de Israel y sus señales y, en último término, quiénes son los herederos de la salvación, descansa sobre los presupuestos que ofrece la “new perspective” y la interpretación que esta corriente de investigación hace de Gal y Rom, interpretación que, como es sabido, no todos aceptan, por considerar que no explica adecuadamente la doctrina paulina sobre la fe y las obras.

Otra cuestión previa que se trata en la “Introduction” es el carácter del trasfondo religioso supuesto por Col. Bevere examina y critica las posturas mantenidas sobre el tema en algunas obras recientes, concluyendo que no se impone, ni mucho menos, la idea de que los elementos religiosos a los que alude la polémica de Col deban explicarse como resultado de un sincretismo religioso. En su opinión, algunos de ellos son evidentemente judíos y el resto se pueden explicar también sobre el mismo trasfondo, sin necesidad de recurrir a un vago sincretismo. En relación con esto ofrece también su reflexión sobre el carácter del material parenético de la carta, que no es ningún añadido, sino parte esencial de su argumento, pues en la manera de obrar está en juego la cuestión de la identidad, esto es, lo que constituye la identidad de los colosenses como pueblo de Dios: la participación en Cristo frente al “covenantal nomism” del judaísmo.

El planteamiento hecho en la “Introduction” deja preparado el camino para afrontar en los dos capítulos siguientes la cuestión fundamental: ¿se puede aplicar a Col el punto de vista de la “new perspective”? ¿Constituye el tema de la los límites de Israel y la pertenencia al pueblo elegido la problemática subyacente a esta carta? El autor intenta demostrar que sí apoyándose en las semejanzas que descubre entre Col y Gal (capítulo 2) y en la presencia, dentro de Col, de “the Israel Motif” (capítulo 3).

Como paso previo a la comparación de las dos cartas, trata la cuestión del autor de Col, inclinándose por atribuirla a Timoteo, quien la habría escrito a petición de Pablo. Esta solución permite explicar las diferencias entre Col y las cartas auténticas y, al mismo tiempo, mantener la “cercanía” de aquella a Gal, punto esencial para su tesis. En cuanto a las claras diferencias entre las dos, de las que no es la menos importante la distinta argumentación que utilizan, las explica afirmando que tratan problemas similares, aunque no iguales. En las iglesias gálatas el problema es provocado por judeocristianos que intentan imponer la circuncisión y la ley a los convertidos de la gentilidad, mientras que en Col la “filosofía” combatida tiene su origen en los judíos que no pertenecen a la Iglesia; no se trataría, pues, del mismo problema – de ahí las diferencias de argumento entre las cartas –, pero sí de problemas que tienen un origen similar, lo que daría razón de las semejanzas. Esta conclusión requeriría una argumentación más sólida, pues queda en el aire la pregunta de por qué, si hay similitud entre los problemas de Galacia y de Colosas, son tan diferentes las respuestas que se dan, sobre todo si el mismo Pablo está detrás del origen de Col, aunque fuera escrita por Timoteo. O, volviendo la pregunta de al revés: ante una manera de argumentar tan diferente en una y otra carta, ¿cabe suponer la existencia de semejanzas entre los problemas a los que pretenden responder?

La semejanza entre ambas cartas la argumenta Bevere a partir de cinco paralelos que percibe entre ellas: en ambas se encuentran referencias a la

circuncisión (Gal 2,1-10.12; 5,1-12; 6,14; Col 2,8-15), al sábado y días festivos (Gal 4,10; Col 2,16), a las leyes sobre alimentos (Gal 4,10; Col 2,16), a los “elementos del mundo” (Gal 4,3.9; Col 2,8.20), y en ambas aparece también una “fórmula de unidad” (Gal 3,28; Col 3,11). No hay problema en admitir estos paralelos o semejanzas entre las dos cartas, pero deducir de ello que son semejantes y que el conflicto de Colosas debía ser semejante al de las iglesias gálatas exigiría no sólo fijarse en las semejanzas, sino también dar razón de las notables diferencias entre Gal y Col. Así, la circuncisión, que es asunto central en Gal, sólo una vez se menciona en Col (2,11) y sólo como punto de contraste con una “circuncisión no hecha por manos de hombre”, la “circuncisión de Cristo” (la interpretación de esta metáfora simplemente como circuncisión del corazón o espiritual no me parece que haga plena justicia a su conexión con la muerte de Cristo). En cuanto al sábado y las fiestas y las leyes sobre alimentos sólo permitirían concluir que hay un componente judío en la “filosofía” colosense, pero no necesariamente que ésta represente la doctrina y praxis de la sinagoga. Por lo que se refiere a la muy problemática expresión “elementos del mundo”, la argumentación de Bevere sobre su carácter judío se apoya en una supuesta relación de los “elementos” con los ángeles (Gal 3,19; Col 2,18) y los principados y potestades (Col 2,15), que necesitaría ser mejor probada. Finalmente, la llamada “formula de unidad” puede ciertamente sugerir un contexto similar para Gal y Col, pero no permite identificarlo con precisión; de hecho, bastaría pensar simplemente en un contexto cristiano en general. En resumen, la argumentación de este capítulo 2 parece insuficiente para probar la existencia de una situación similar y concluir que la “filosofía” de Colosas refleja la doctrina y las prácticas de la sinagoga de la ciudad.

También la argumentación del capítulo 3 sobre la presencia del “Israel motif” en Col tiene puntos débiles. No es evidente que la carta identifique a Cristo con la Sabiduría (cf. Col 2,3), aunque ciertamente se predicán de él, sobre todo en el himno (Col 1,15-20), los atributos de la Sabiduría; y todavía resulta más problemático probar que se le identifica con la Torah. No puede pasarse por alto que en Col no aparece ni una sola vez el término *nomos*, una ausencia que no sólo compromete la semejanza de Col con Gal, sino que resulta sorprendente si la carta va dirigida contra la pretensión de los judíos de ser ellos los herederos de la promesa, el verdadero Israel, definido por sus señas de identidad, la circuncisión y la ley, fundamentalmente. En esta misma línea, habría que explicar por qué en Col no aparece la contraposición entre fe y obras, ni el rechazo explícito de la circuncisión y la ley, aunque sí se rechacen algunos elementos de ésta (sábado y leyes sobre los alimentos) y otras prácticas que quizá tenían también carácter judío (culto de ángeles, prácticas ascéticas); incluso debería explicarse la ausencia casi total de citas bíblicas, a las que tan abundantemente recurre Pablo en Gal y Rom para argumentar contra la necesidad de la circuncisión y la ley para la salvación.

En consecuencia, las pruebas aducidas — paralelos con Gal, presencia del “Israel Motif” —, si bien apuntan a la tesis defendida por el autor, no parecen suficientes para concluir que la “filosofía” combatida por Col representa la postura judía sobre la pertenencia al pueblo de Dios y que la misiva constituye la respuesta a la solicitud que los judíos hacen a los creyentes a integrarse en Israel por medio de la circuncisión y la observancia de la ley. Para establecer

con firmeza esta conclusión sería necesario fundamentarla también en la parte “doctrinal” de la carta. Mientras esto no se haga, resulta precipitado asumir la idea de que los colosenses estuvieran tentados a hacerse judíos y no simplemente a buscar en las prácticas criticadas por la carta un complemento o un perfeccionamiento de la salvación que han recibido por medio de Cristo. Pues no resulta claro que la “filosofía” niegue la mediación salvífica de éste; sus defensores quizá ni siquiera la consideraban contraria a la fe en él, siendo más bien el autor de Col quien percibe esa oposición y la pone al descubierto, haciendo ver que Cristo es el único y exclusivo mediador de salvación, por lo que, además de inútil, es perjudicial buscar por otros medios una mayor perfección o una salvación más plena.

A diferencia de lo que ocurre en Gal, donde es patente la gravedad de la amenaza que se cierne sobre los creyentes, en Col no resulta claro que esté en juego la cuestión de cómo se alcanza la salvación (la justificación, según el lenguaje paulino), si por la fe en Cristo o por las obras de la ley (aunque se entienda, de acuerdo con la “new perspective”, que “obras de la ley” expresa la pertenencia al pueblo de la alianza y no la pretensión de auto-justificarse). Más bien lo que Col pretende es aclarar las implicaciones y consecuencias que tiene haber alcanzado la salvación (expresada con diversas imágenes: redención, perdón de los pecados, reconciliación...) por medio de Cristo, con el consiguiente rechazo de creencias y comportamientos que resultan incoherentes con esta realidad, como lo eran los propugnados por la “filosofía”, lo mismo que las conductas negativas criticadas en la sección parenética. En este aspecto lleva razón Bevere al afirmar que la parénesis está integrada en el argumento global de la carta y que no es simplemente un bloque yuxtapuesto a la enseñanza doctrinal, si bien, como él mismo reconoce, la relación es menos evidente y más genérica en el caso del “código doméstico”.

Antes de concluir, un par de observaciones desde el punto de vista de la presentación del libro: la primera, que se echa de menos un índice de contenidos más detallado, pues el que aparece al comienzo sólo incluye los títulos de los capítulos; la segunda, que se ha descuidado la revisión tipográfica del texto griego, de manera que son abundantísimas las erratas; en la mayoría de los casos afectan a acentos y espíritus, pero son numerosos también otros errores de más calado — letras cambiadas u omitidas, separación en dos de una única palabra, fusión en una de dos palabras... — que hacen incomprensible el texto.

Para concluir y resumiendo, hay que destacar la originalidad del estudio de Bevere, que abre un camino nuevo al aplicar a la interpretación de Col los puntos de vista de la “new perspective on Paul”, así como el serio trabajo exegético que realiza, especialmente de la sección parenética de la carta, mostrando que es posible explicarla recurriendo únicamente al trasfondo cristiano y judío de Colosas, sin necesidad de postular la existencia de un hipotético sincretismo religioso. Igualmente es digna de alabanza la claridad de la exposición, a la que contribuye mucho la presencia, al final de las distintas secciones de cada capítulo, de una “conclusion” que sintetiza los argumentos expuestos y los resultados alcanzados.

John A.L. LEE, *A History of New Testament Lexicography* (Studies in Biblical Greek 8). New York, Peter Lang, 2003. xiv-414 p. 15,5 × 23. \$39.95

This engagingly iconoclastic book is not just a work full of useful facts about the history of New Testament lexicography, as the title suggests. It is that, but it is also much more. It is critique of the history of New Testament lexicography with value judgments galore, and some suggestions for needed reforms. Perhaps "A Critical History of New Testament Lexicography" would have been a more appropriate title. In any event, this is an excellent piece of scholarship and one which anyone who has indulged in exegesis of the New Testament could well read and savor, even if he or she is not a professional New Testament lexicographer.

Professor Lee taught Classical and Koine Greek at the University of Sydney for thirty years before retiring. He is now affiliated with Macquarie University where is engaged in co-authoring (with G.H.R. Horsley) *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament with Documentary Parallels*, a work designed to replace Moulton and Milligan's *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*. If the present book is any indication, the replacement of Moulton-Milligan is be well worth waiting for.

The body of the book is divided into two parts: Part I is an Historical Survey (1-190), followed by Part II, Case Studies (191-320). A detailed list of New Testament lexicons and related bibliographies follows, together with some instructive appendices and useful indices (321-414). The volume is well edited, as one has come to expect of the volumes of "Studies in Biblical Greek".

The enemy throughout the first part is the gloss. A principal thesis of Lee is that it is time for New Testament lexicography to begin to separate from the New Testament glossary and to give definitions of Greek words instead of translations. He gives as an example of what he has in mind the work of J.P. Louw and E.A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domain*, and published in 1988. He makes these sage comments (165):

Louw and Nida's lexicon is an important advance, even though it is anchored in the existing tradition and one may find fault with some aspects of the execution. The introduction of the definition approach is its most significant contribution to New Testament lexicography. It will be a stimulus to others to follow on the same path, as well as a resource and model for definitions — as has already begun to happen. Further debate and practical experiment on the question of how to define, and on other issues raised here, are desirable and will be beneficial.

The reviewer certainly concurs in this view. But he would also not like to see the demise of the gloss as a means of conveying meaning. Provided that the limitations of the gloss approach and the advantages of the definition approach are kept firmly in mind, it would seem desirable to use both in a New Testament dictionary. For example, for the exegete it is more useful to know that *συκῆ* means "fig tree" than to know its definition. And thus, more "scientific" as well, when one takes the purpose of the dictionary in mind.

For the people of the New Testament moved in the realm of glosses, not definitions, for many things, and it is the task of the exegete to sort these things out in his attempt to get to what the text is attempting to say. Lee recognizes the usefulness of glosses and has some interesting comments about their role in a lexicography dominated by definition (185, 187).

Some of the best comments in the book are buried in the second part in the essays on individual Greek words. This is understandable, given that many of these essays are reprints of previous work published as articles. But it is important to note this for anyone who wants a detailed view of Lee's position. Particularly rewarding are his comments at the end of his contribution on ἔξις (289-290). There he makes three points: 1. New Testament lexicons use material uncritically from their predecessors. 2. New Testament lexicons use standard translations for meanings. 3. New Testament lexicons are unreliable in their use of material in commentaries and elsewhere. The uncritical use of predecessors is well known to anyone who has himself been a lexicographer, but it should be always kept in mind by those who use lexicons (Point 1). Lexicons rely on standard translations just as translators rely on standard lexicons, and this should be kept in mind by anyone attempting to come to grips with a text who seeks in vain for help from a lexicon (Point 2). Many dictionaries provide much material from commentaries and elsewhere, but much continues to be missed or is not interpreted well (Point 3).

In brief, life is short and brutish, and perhaps the lexicographer's life in the context of his duties, shorter and more brutish still. With all his strictures, Lee is well aware that lexicographers in the past rendered yeoman service and should be judged appreciatively in the context of the limitations of their times (49).

Perhaps the outstanding discussion in Part II is the treatment of ἀγαπητός (193-211) in which Lee forcefully contests the commonly accepted view that the word can mean "only". The reviewer found his views suasive on the basis of denotation: it seems clear that the word does not denote "only". But if the *connotation* of ἀγαπητός is the focus of attention the reviewer is not fully convinced that the word in certain contexts does not carry with it the suggestion of "only". Traditional lexicography does not fare well in the realm of connotation, for connotation demands context and context is found only in sentences, not isolated words. The whole question of connotation with regard to lexicography is fraught with the danger of eisegesis, but since connotation is part of literary communication in general it would seem to be a part of New Testament communication in particular.

Lee ends Part I with some practical suggestions for the future of New Testament lexicography. The goal, as he sees it, is "the practical one of delivering an accurate description of the meaning of each Greek word in the New Testament, along with whatever related information is necessary or useful" (182). His points:

1) The need for an electronic data base: "The important thing is that it should be a collection of *all* the data relevant to the lexicography of the New Testament" (183).

2) The importance of realizing that the project will never be completed: "... the whole purpose is to provide not a static entity but one that can keep on incorporating and reacting to new material that becomes available" (183).

3) The co-operative nature of the enterprise: "The benefit of sharing the work is twofold: not only can the sheer labor be spread by parcelling out portions to different persons; there is also much to be gained from a second opinion or perspective" (184).

4) The primary importance of definitions as opposed to glosses: "The gloss method of stating this has delivered a poor result in the past; definitions (as understood in this book) offer the best prospect of advance" (184).

5) The need for a reliable collection of data on biblical and extra-biblical material: "As we have seen, the present collection, for all its great extent, is unsatisfactory. To get our house in order, it is necessary both to make the collection for each word complete, and to ensure that it is properly assessed" (185).

6) The need to be alert to the way the New Testament lexicon is to be structured: "It will be already evident that I envisage maintaining the traditional, practical approach to the lexicon, that is, to state the lexical meaning(s) of each individual lexeme, rather than a radically different one giving priority to a systematic presentation of the lexical structure, or sense-relations, of the whole vocabulary" (186). (Perhaps one could here interject that it might be advisable to envision the possibility of both types of lexicographical approach.)

7) The need to be flexible in assessing what the final products of all this is: "The suggestion here is for the primary repository of information to take the form of an electronic database available online to all. . . . Handy tools targeted to specific users' needs would still be a desideratum" (187).

And the final words: "It is to be hoped that the above program does not itself make strange reading in a century's time. But even if it does, it may at least have provoked a debate leading to an improved approach, instead of a continuation of the past flawed history" (188).

The reviewer can do nothing but say "Amen" to what seems an eminently sane approach to the future of New Testament lexicography.

But one comment is in order. Perhaps Lee could have adverted more explicitly to the role of handmaiden which New Testament lexicography has with regard to the larger enterprise of New Testament exegesis. He remarks at one point about the distance between the modern lexicographer and the material he is assessing ("We should keep in mind that much about the tone of these words is inevitably lost to us" [244]). It is the task of the exegete to try to recapture the tone of words as they are used in the text of the New Testament. Words don't really encapsulate meaning apart from their use in sentences. And the assessment of the meaning of sentences in context (note the approval given by Lee [250, n. 1] to a statement of P. Chantraine on the importance of context) is the domain of the exegete. (How does lexicography handle irony, for example?) The challenges of New Testament lexicography are great, as this splendid book makes it clear. But the challenges of New Testament exegesis are even greater.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Rome, Italy

James SWETNAM

Varia

Pierre DE MARTIN DE VIVIÉS, *Apocalypses et cosmologie du salut* (LD 191), Paris, Les Editions du Cerf, 2002. 416 p. 13,5 × 21,5. € 37.00

A livello di studi specialistici è da tempo ben acquisito il fatto che i termini 'apocalisse, apocalittico' non hanno la semantica divulgata a livello popolare, che ne ha fatto purtroppo dei sinonimi di 'catastrofe, catastrofico'. L'antica letteratura apocalittica infatti non si proponeva affatto di coltivare l'inquietudine o la paura, ma al contrario tendeva, doppiamente, a spiegare l'origine del male nel mondo e ancor più a offrire un messaggio di speranza a coloro che del male erano vittime.

Il nostro Autore studia una componente particolare di quella letteratura: la funzione che in essa svolge lo spazio, e quindi la sua dimensione cosmologica. Partendo dall'elenco delle caratteristiche proprie dell'apocalittica (la pseudonimia, il simbolismo esoterico, il pessimismo dualistico, il determinismo storico), intesa soprattutto come caratterizzata da una rivelazione sul senso della storia, egli vi aggiunge un dato in più: quello di una certa organizzazione del cosmo, che consiste nella distinzione tra "mondo in alto" e "mondo in basso". Il primo, come si precisa fin dall'Introduzione (9), concerne il mondo celeste e insieme la possibilità di un mondo sopra-celeste come ambito riservato a Dio. Il secondo comprende il mondo terrestre ma anche il mondo infra-terrestre. Certo va riconosciuto che, benché questi tratti non siano esclusivi dell'apocalittica, essa tuttavia riserva loro un'attenzione particolare. Infatti essa si interessa marcatamente sia agli abitanti di questi mondi (specialmente agli uomini, ma anche ad altre creature come angeli, demoni, giganti) sia alla loro mutua interazione tanto per il bene quanto per il male.

Lo studio viene condotto sulla base di una scelta operata fra gli scritti della molteplice e variegata letteratura apocalittica e analizza solo tre opere: il Libro di Vigilanti dell'Enoch etiopico (*LV*), il libro di Daniele (*Dan*), e l'Apocalisse di Giovanni (*Ap*). Il procedimento messo in atto è costituito da un doppio momento: in una Prima Parte (23-180), l'Autore studia separatamente in ciascuno dei tre scritti l'eziologia del male per precisare le figure che rappresentano il male stesso e quindi ciò da cui bisogna essere salvati; una Seconda Parte (181-371) è più ampiamente consacrata invece alle figure rappresentative della salvezza, considerate cumulativamente nei tre scritti.

Bisogna confessare che, se consideriamo la vastità del *corpus* letterario riconducibile al genere apocalittico (per esempio J.J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, New York 1992, computa almeno diciassette scritti del genere, senza contare vari filoni propri dei manoscritti di Qumran), la prima impressione è che la scelta di quelli analizzati qui si presenta piuttosto limitata. Tuttavia, bisogna pure ammettere che non sarebbe stato possibile in una sola monografia prendere in esame il tema nell'intera produzione apocalittica, a rischio di cadere in superficialità e generalizzazioni tipiche delle introduzioni. Il presente lavoro invece rappresenta un saggio

di scavo molto originale e utile, che collocandosi in un angolo d'osservazione ben circoscritto permette però di gettare uno sguardo competente sull'insieme; d'altronde, non mancano affatto riferimenti espliciti ad altre produzioni dello stesso ambito. Nell'insieme esso rappresenta un eccellente contributo allo studio dell'apocalittica considerata sia in se stessa sia in rapporto ai suoi risvolti neotestamentari. Va tuttavia notata una carenza nello studio in oggetto: il fatto cioè che l'Autore non coordina il tema dei due "mondi" con quello correlativo dei due "eoni", che è tipico almeno dell'apocrifo *4Esd.* È vero che la scelta cade esclusivamente su altre tre opere, ma almeno un confronto, un richiamo si sarebbe potuto fare, poiché, se è vero che il termine *'lm/saeculum* ha una prevalente semantica temporale più che cosmologica, questa però è tutt'altro che assente; la cosa sarebbe stata tanto più interessante in quanto il concetto di doppio eone torna nella successiva letteratura gnostica come designazione duale di diversi ambiti sovrapposti più che di diversi momenti successivi.

Il quadro tracciato dall'Autore nell'analisi dei tre libri presi in considerazione, di ciascuno dei quali egli mette in luce la prospettiva sua propria, è il seguente. Nella prima parte, il *LV*, che propone una originale eziologia del male, fa vedere come agenti del mondo in alto (Azazel e Shemeyaza con i loro accoliti) violano l'ordine cosmico, sia accoppiandosi con le figlie degli uomini sia rivelando cose interdette, influenzando così negativamente sul mondo in basso mediante una perturbazione permanente. Da parte sua, invece, *Dan* mostra un movimento inverso, sia in quanto i perturbatori non sono esseri celesti ma solo terrestri/storici (da Nabucodonosor ad Antioco IV Epifane) sia in quanto costoro sconvolgendo il calendario (in pratica, opponendosi al sabato) desincronizzano la storia e turbano il buon funzionamento dei due mondi. Quanto all'*Ap*, essa conosce una figura malefica centrale, superiore a tutte, cioè il Drago, che ha a che fare con i due mondi, poiché comincia a perturbare il mondo in alto (opposizione al Messia che sta per essere generato "in cielo") e viene poi gettato nel mondo in basso ("sulla terra") dove prosegue la sua azione malvagia.

Nella seconda parte, l'Autore studia in primo luogo le figure di salvezza menzionate per nome nei tre libri: Michele, Gabriele, Raffaele, Uriele, e altri; ciò che ne risulta è il loro ruolo di ponte tra i due mondi, volto essenzialmente ad assicurare che le decisioni prese nel mondo in alto raggiungano il mondo in basso e vi siano eseguite; vi emerge soprattutto la figura di un *angelus interpres*, mentre nessuno esercita la funzione di giudice e nessuno ha poteri divini (eccettuato in parte il Michele del *LV*). In secondo luogo, si considerano le figure non identificate, come l'angelo antropomorfo di *Dan* 10, l'angelo potente di *Ap* 10,1; 5,1; 18,21, e soprattutto il misterioso Figlio d'uomo in *Dan* 7 e nel Libro delle Parabole dell'Enoch etiopico (*LP*, qui confrontato con l'Eletto). Infine, un buon capitolo è dedicato alla figura di Cristo in *Ap* e alle sue varie metafore, come quella più sviluppata dell'agnello, e poi quelle più circoscritte dell'uomo incoronato (14,14) e del cavaliere combattente (19,11-16). Un capitolo conclusivo (373-400) espone le caratteristiche proprie dell'apocalittica: benché connotate da termini piuttosto generali, sono pagine che non mancano comunque di originalità e di incisività.

Lo studio condotto dall'Autore si risolve di fatto anche in un lavoro sull'angelologia e sul trapasso che essa subì fino alla cristologia, cioè dall'antico e innominato "angelo di Yhwh" fino alla figura concreta e storica di Cristo, passando attraverso varie entità di intermediari tra Dio e l'uomo, che si configurano o come specifici esseri angelici o come una figura singola quale quella del Figlio dell'uomo di *LP*. In particolare, viene sottolineato il fatto secondo cui dal profetismo all'apocalittica si allarga molto il quadro spazio-temporale della soteriologia, con vantaggi e inconvenienti, come la relativizzazione dell'uomo in seno alla creazione, quasi che egli non fosse l'unico padrone del proprio destino per l'intervento di esseri extra-umani in parte ostili, l'apertura ad apporti muticulturali, il contributo a un atteggiamento di speranza, ecc.

In particolare, le lunghe pagine dedicate alla figura del Figlio d(ell)'uomo in Dan 7 e in *LP* così come quelle consacrate alla cristologia di Ap offrono un buon esempio di analisi. La discussione procede sempre attenta ai dettagli del testo e aperta alle sue possibili interpretazioni, tra cui l'Autore si destreggia con saggezza per ottenere delle soluzioni ben bilanciate. Purtroppo la Bibliografia finale riporta solo una parte degli Autori e delle opere utilizzate nel corpo del testo (dove peraltro è assente ogni riferimento a produzioni italiane).

Pont. Università Lateranense
Piazza S. Giovanni in Laterano, 4
I - 00120 Roma

Romano PENNA

Gabriele BOCCACCINI, *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism. An Intellectual History, from Ezekiel to Daniel*. Grand Rapids, Michigan - Cambridge, U.K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2002. xvi-230 p. 15 × 23. \$24.00 - £16.99

Apart from his many essays, Gabriele Boccaccini is well known through his two earlier books on aspects of Jewish thought: *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought, 300 B.C.E to 200 C.E.* (Minneapolis 1991), and especially through his more recent work: *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI 1998). In the preface to the work under review he deals summarily with his earlier work, with this volume and his future plans on this subject. He recalls that the idea that already during the Second Temple period Rabbinic Judaism was normative or mainstream Judaism belongs to the history of scholarly research (with reference to J. Jeremias, G.F. Moore, J.S. Bonsirven). Rabbinic Judaism was discontinuous with both Scripture, as it represented a sustained and organised development and interpretation of the biblical traditions, and Second Temple period, as the shift from Second Temple Judaism to rabbinic Judaism was not a mere chronological transition but a substantive change (citing L.H. Schiffman). Rabbinic Judaism did not even begin to dominate the religious imagination and life patterns of large groups of Jews until the 3rd

century C.E. at the earliest. And it did not finally succeed until well after 650 C.E. (citing M.S. Jaffee). This is not to deny that elements of Rabbinic Judaism are or can be very old. Both Christians and sages built their system of thought upon the foundations that other Judaisms had laid before them. The issue of antecedents and forerunners must be examined afresh, out of the founding myth each group developed to validate their existence and authority.

The book proper opens with a lengthy introduction of forty-one pages on “the intellectual quest of Rabbinic origins and roots”. It first treats of the founding myth of Rabbinic Judaism: Back to Sinai, and chronicles the scholarly rejection of the traditional view of monolithic Judaism. We then are given a treatment of new views on the replacement of this monolithic Judaism with “Judaisms”. B. examines four scholarly models: E.P. Sanders who believes that any discourse about Jewish diversity and historical changes regards the accidents, not the essence, of Judaism. He also considers the views of L.H. Schiffman, Shaye J.D. Cohen and Martin S. Jaffee, and finally that of Jacob Neusner, whose approach is characterised by his renunciation of defining any essence or unity, intellectual or historical, of Judaism. For Neusner we define Judaisms, not Judaism. B. leads us on from here with a lengthy section on the rise of intellectual history: through Descartes, Spinoza, Kant, Hegel, Hegelianism, the Italian Benedetto Croce, Léon Robin and Émile Bréhier, leading up to Italy and a new generation of philosophers, led by Eugenio Garin, who attacked and demolished, in article after article, the philosophical premises of the Hegelian unity of history and philosophy. B. notes that as an intellectual historian educated in Florence at the school of Eugenio Garin, he himself has great sympathy with the general principles of Garin’s methodology and real respect and admiration for his former teacher Paolo Sacchi, one who has first consistently applied these principles to the study of ancient Jewish thought. He goes on to speak of canons and corpora of writings. These make sense only in relation to the epoch and ideology in which they were born, and tell us the fascinating history of how ancient texts were collected, selected, and handed down to us, and how religious groups found identity and legitimacy in the process. Neither the abundance of parallels nor the sharing of the same literary genre (or worldview) is enough to determine an ideological connection among documents. Only a holistic comparison of systems of thought can do so. Systemic analysis is called for. Systemic analysis, B. notes, is an interdisciplinary enterprise, aiming at a comprehensive assessment of the ideological relations among ancient sources. By borrowing criteria commonly used in the study of intellectual history (or history of philosophy), systemic analysis offers a reliable methodology both to deconstruct the traditional corpora and reconstruct the original relations among documents. By taking into consideration the complexity of literary, sociological, historical, and ideological factors, it establishes a continuum among groups of related writings, thus identifying a variety of synchronic “chains of documents” or “communities of texts” that correspond to different varieties of ancient Judaism. B.’s final section in this preface is on the question: ‘How does Rabbinic Judaism connect with Second Temple Judaisms?’ In this he is in dialogue mainly with Jacob Neusner (*The Four Stages of Rabbinic Judaism* [London 1999]), who professes himself unable to connect the rabbinic system to any known Second Temple

Judaisms. B., with others, does not accept such a minimalist approach to rabbinic origins. He notes that the sages (of Rabbinic Judaism) had the strongest interest in eradicating even the memory of any connection of their Judaism with previous Judaisms which, in their eyes, would have contaminated the autonomy of their tradition. Instead they built the artificial bridge of their chain of tradition. Applying a text of Eugenio Garin, he notes that in searching the roots of Rabbinic Judaism, historians have no alternative but to excavate the realities of Second Temple Judaism.

After forty-six pages of preliminary material B. passes to detailed consideration of the evidence, beginning (in chapter one) on the rise of Zadokite Judaism, with an initial section on the struggle for priestly supremacy. The earliest document in which we read a claim for Zadokite supremacy is Ezekiel 40–48, from the time of the Babylonian exile. The text is clearly polemical and innovative. It neither expresses a nostalgic view nor describes an actual situation; it is a political and religious agenda for the future restoration of Israel. The aim is to lay the foundations of a new order that in the eyes of its proponents has to be profoundly different from that of pre-exilic Judaism. The autonomous traditions, associated with Nehemiah and Ezra, the Priestly writings (P), and Chronicles are the major literary accomplishments of Zadokite Judaism in the early Second Temple period and allow us, if not to understand historical details, at least to follow the gradual establishment of the Zadokite power step by step. The Zadokites succeeded in reaching their primary goal: the rebuilt temple was not simply the restoration of the old sanctuary but a new one with new rules and a new priesthood. They also succeeded in excluding most of their Levitical rivals from the priesthood. A distinction arose between the sons of Zadok (now referred to as 'high priests'), who were enlisted as the direct descendants of Aaron's grandson Phinehas, and the other descendants of Aaron's son Eleazar and Ithamar (the 'priests'), and between them and the rest of the descendants of Levi (the 'levites'). The creation of the Aaronite priesthood was a post-exilic phenomenon. It was the Priestly writing and Chronicles which legitimized and standardized the new threefold structure of priestly power by transferring it back to both the mythical and the historical past of Israel. The rabbinic chain of tradition that traces the origins of their movement back to Sinai had illustrious antecedents in the priestly genealogies.

B. goes on (in chapter 2) to treat of Zadokite Judaism and its opponents, beginning with a presentation of the Zadokite worldview. Zadokite Judaism was a society that unceasingly and persistently defined the boundaries of cosmic and social structure; rules and regulations were enforced to restrict or control interaction and avoid trespassing. By creation (as in Gen 1,1–2,4a) the Priestly writing means the process through which God organized the cosmos by defining the boundaries of time, space and society. A coherent mechanism of 'graded holiness' preserves the harmony of the system and makes the created world an orderly and closely related hierarchy of living beings, spaces and times. The process of creation did not eliminate the disruptive forces of chaos, but confined them within precise boundaries. The covenantal relationship between God and Israel, as understood by the Zadokites, is a pact for the stability and welfare of the universe. Compliance with the purity and moral laws of the covenant brings about stability and

survival for the Jewish society as well as stability and survival for the entire world. At the core of the Sinaitic covenant is now the Jerusalem temple. The Day of Atonement was the climax of the temple cult and the highlight of Zadokite theology. The Zadokite order drastically reduced the cultic and religious importance of the prophets. By the end of the monarchy the prophets had already lost the most important war, that of survival. As the voice of the prophets as an autonomous group weakened, gradually their opposition was reabsorbed and accommodated within the Zadokite structure of power.

B. then moves on to an important section of his book: Priestly Opposition: Enochic Judaism. By 'Enochic Judaism' he means that form of Judaism found in the Book of Watchers, Aramaic Levi and the Astronomical Book. These works are pre-Qumran and pre-200 BCE. The catalyst of this Enochic Judaism was a unique concept of the origin of evil that made the 'fallen angels' (the 'sons of God', also recorded in Genesis 6,1-6) as ultimately responsible for the spread of evil and impurity on earth. The anti-Zadokite implications of the Enochic myth are obvious. Against the Zadokite idea of stability and order the Enochians argued that God's order was no more, having been replaced by the current disorder. Against this idea of stability and order the Enochians introduced the concept of 'the end of days', as the time of final judgement and vindication beyond death and history. Thirdly they openly challenged the legitimacy of the ruling priesthood. B. considers the various views on the origin and date of Enochic Judaism. He believes that there are compelling reasons that prevent us from seeing Enochic Judaism as a conservative pre-Zadokite movement, and indicate a more likely post-Zadokite setting, even within Zadokite Judaism. Both Enochic and Zadokite Judaism can legitimately claim a father-child relationship with the exiled prophet priest (Ezekiel). There is now a widespread scholarly consensus that in the Enochic literature the myth of the fallen angels is a mirror of intra-priestly conflict. He favours a pre-Hellenistic and fourth-century date for its origins. Unlike the situation with the Samaritans, we have no evidence that the Enochians formed a schismatic community, in Palestine or elsewhere. It was only the Maccabean Revolt that caused Enochic Judaism to grow and expand into a movement of dissent that would ultimately be known as Essenism.

B. passes on to treat of sapiential Judaism: the lay opposition of Zadokite Judaism. The books of Ahiqar, Proverbs, Job and Jonah testify to the continuity of scribal schools from pre-exilic times throughout the Persian period. In post-exilic Jewish texts, such as Job 28 and Proverbs 1-9, the language is still largely that of polytheism, although now in a context of a henotheistic exaltation of the God of Israel, which identifies YHWH with the father of the gods in the Canaanite pantheon. From the sapiential perspective the rules of partnership between God and humans as established by the Mosaic covenant simply do not work.

The third chapter covers the rapprochement between Zadokite and sapiential Judaism during the Hellenistic era. Qoheleth belongs to the same tradition of skeptical wisdom as Job and Jonah. His skepticism is much more radical. He directs penetrating and continuous criticism against the foundations of Zadokite covenantal theology without conceding anything to Enochic thought. B. believes that it is difficult not to relate the book of Tobit

('a few decades before the end of the 3rd century') to the powerful family of the Tobiads of the Transjordan. He sees in this book an unexpected supporter of Zadokite Judaism. The relationship between Zadokite and Sapiential Judaism in the book of Tobit was a marriage of convenience, not yet a merging. The close relationship was established a little later, in the golden ages of Zadokite Judaism, with Ben Sira's synthesis of Zadokite and sapiential Judaism.

The final chapter (chapter 4) examines Daniel: a third way between Zadokite and Enochic Judaism.

The work ends with a very useful, if brief, summary and a conclusion. The contribution of Daniel was certainly not without consequences for the principles of Zadokite Judaism. But it is certainly with great caution that one may label Daniel as the first proto-rabbinic text. The boundaries of the apocalyptic group that produced Daniel were not yet so well defined. What followed Daniel was long period of gestation, a troubled period of experimentation, out of which a new creature had to take its shape after experiencing all the forms of growth of the newborn. Behind the four centuries of 'silence' from Daniel to the Mishnah there was a time of greatest creativity, on both the intellectual and literary levels – the glorious and yet so neglected period of rabbinic origins.

There is a rich bibliography, and a single index of modern authors.

Readers will welcome B.'s learned work for the detailed information it contains, and also for his particular approach of systemic analysis and the assessment of the ideological relations among ancient sources. In this attempt at an intellectual history he admits his dependence of his fellow Florence scholar Eugenio Garin. This systemic approach has interested B. for some time. In a paper read to the Dublin international conference in 1992 on 'The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context' he approached Targum Neofiti from this angle: 'Targum Neofiti as a Proto-rabbinic Document: A Systemic Approach' (published in *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context* [ed. D.R.G. Beattie – M.J. McNamara] [JSOTSS 166; Sheffield 1994] 54-263). B. himself has clearly expressed the dangers in this approach. The present reviewer would like to make a few observations apropos.

One danger is that concentration on this approach may take attention from the diversity within the particular texts studied, texts which may have arisen in a culture with multiple interests. While this professes to be an intellectual history from Ezekiel to Daniel, it is apparently the concentration on rabbinic Judaism that has limited the sources used to those believed directly involved. Much of the literature of the Second Temple period has not been considered, principally the prophetic corpus, whether that in the newly composed works or in the recasting of the teaching of the earlier prophets.

While the study shows how the two main corpora (the Priestly writing and Chronicles) present ideological expressions of Zadokite Judaism, concentration on the ideological element can distract from the underlying theology of the movement, for instance the positive content of the creation narrative (Gen 1,1-2,4a), sin and atonement, and the significance of the entire atonement system. The theology of the documents is also probably older than the post-exilic priesthood. Ideological expressions of competing forms of

Judaism may well have been working within an accepted framework of beliefs. B. holds that Enochism, one such competing form, accepted the basic Zadokite position, and this already in the fourth century BCE. Mosaic Judaism, as associated with the work of Ezra, may by then have been the commonly accepted guide to life in the Palestinian Restoration community. Sapiential Judaism (which was surely monotheistic in the Second Temple period), with its early roots, may also have been working within this system. Should we not regard the wisdom and prophetic heritages as complementary to, rather than competing with, the Zadokite system? Since in exploration such as that carried out in this work methodology has a large part to play, it may be possible unite the concerns expressed by B. in his introduction and awareness of the fuller picture of Second Temple Judaism in its various component parts.

It will be for the reader to assess whether B. has proved his point about the Zadokite revolution, and the bearing of the evidence on the question of the roots of Rabbinic Judaism. We are grateful to him for this study and look forward to the promised volume on rabbinic origins from Daniel to the Mishnah.

Woodview House
34 Mount Merrion Avenue
Blackrock
Co. Dublin
Ireland

Martin McNAMARA

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

Tutti i libri o i fascicoli che vengono inviati alla Direzione appaiono in questo elenco. Il fatto che vi figurino non implica alcun giudizio su di essi. Recensioni più ampie dei libri verranno fatte secondo il parere del Redattore.

I libri inviati alla Direzione che non sono stati chiesti direttamente per recensione non si restituiscono in nessun caso, anche se non potranno essere recensiti. Tutti i libri insieme con gli estratti di articoli inviati alla Direzione vengono trasmessi all'Editore dell' *Elenchus of Biblica* e vi appariranno secondo il giudizio dell'Editore.

I libri vanno inviati alla "Direzione di *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico – Via della Pilotta, 25 – I-00187 Roma – Italia".

Bar-Asher, M. – Dimant, D. (eds.), *Meghillot* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls 1). Jerusalem, The Bialik Institute, 2003. xii-246 p. 17 × 24

Barbiero, Gianni, *Dio di misericordia e di grazia.* La rivelazione del volto di Dio in *Esodo* 32–34. Casale Monferrato, Portalupi Editore, 2002. 199 p. 13 × 21. €10

Barton, John, *Understanding Old Testament Ethics.* Approaches and Explorations. Louisville – London, Westminster John Knox Press, 2003. xi-212 p. 15 × 23

Bauer, David R., *An Annotated Guide to Biblical Resources for Ministry.* Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 2003. viii-327 p. 16,5 × 22,5

Beirne, Margaret M., *Women and Men in the Fourth Gospel.* A Genuine Discipleship of Equals (JSNTSS 242). London, Sheffield Academic Press, 2003. xiii-254 p. 16 × 24. £60.00

Benson, Clarence H., *Biblical Faith.* Doctrines Every Christian Should Know (Biblical Essentials). Wheaton, Illinois, Crossway Books, 2003. 125 p. 14 × 21,5. \$10.99

Bergant, Dianne, CSA, *Lamentations* (Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries). Nashville, Abingdon Press, 2003. 144 p. 15,5 × 23. \$20.00

Blenkinsopp, Joseph, *Isaiah 56-66.* A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 19B). New York, Doubleday, 2003. xvi-348 p. 15,5 × 24. \$45.00

Bordreuil, Pierre – Briquel-Chatonnet, Françoise, *Le temps de la Bible* (Folio / Histoire 122). Paris, Éditions Gallimard, 2003. 461 p. 11 × 18. €7,10

Braulik, Georg – Lohfink, Norbert, *Osternacht und Altes Testament.* Studien und Vorschläge. Mit einer Exultetvertonung von Erwin Bücken. (Österreichische Biblische Studien 22). Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang, 2003. 249 p. 17 × 24. € 37,20

Braulik, Georg (Hrsg.), *Das Deuteronomium* (Österreichische Biblische Studien 23). Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang, 2003. 378 p. 17 × 24. €45,80

Bridge, Steven L., *'Where the Eagles are Gathered'.* The Deliverance of the Elect in Lukan Eschatology (JSNTSS 240). London, Sheffield Academic Press, 2003. xix-193 p. 16 × 24. £50.00

Brown, Jeannine, *The Disciples in Narrative Perspective*. The Portrayal and Function of the Matthean Disciples (Academia Biblica 9). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2002. xii-171 p. 15 × 23. \$29.95

Burnet, Régis, *Épîtres et lettres, I^{er}-II^e siècle*. De Paul de Tarse à Polycarpe de Smyrne (LD 192). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2003. 458 p. 13,5 × 21,5. €25

Burnside, Jonathan P., *The Signs of Sin*. Seriousness of Offence in Biblical Law (JSOTSS 364). London, Sheffield Academic Press, 2003. xvi-282 p. 16 × 24. £60.00

Byrnes, Michael, *Conformation to the Death of Christ and the Hope of Resurrection*. An Exegetico-Theological Study of 2 Corinthians 4,7-15 and Philippians 3,7-11. (Tesi Gregoriana, Serie Teologia 99). Roma, Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 2003. 321 p. 17 × 24. €20

Calduch-Benages, Nuria – Ferrer, Joan – Liesen, Jan, *La sabiduría del escriba*, Wisdom of the Scribe. Edición diplomática de la versión siríaca del libro de Ben Sira según el Códice Ambrosiano, con traducción española e inglesa. Diplomatic Edition of the Syriac Version of the Book of Ben Sira according to Codex Ambrosianus, with Translations in Spanish and English (Biblioteca Midrásica 26). Estella, Editorial Verbo Divino, 2003. 271 p. 16 × 24

Campbell, Antony, S.J., *1 Samuel* (The Forms of the Old Testament Literature 7). Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U.K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2003. xviii-350 p. 15 × 23. \$55.00 – £39.99

Cazeaux, Jacques, *Saül, David, Salomon*. La Royauté et le destin d'Israël (LD 193). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2003. 417 p. 13 × 21,5. €30

Cernuda, Antonio Vicent, *Jesús perseguido a muerte*. Estudios exegeticos sobre las personas y los hechos (Monografías 82). Madrid, Fundación Universitaria Española, 2003. 365 p. 17 × 24

Chilton, Bruce, *Redeeming Time*. The Wisdom of Ancient Jewish and Christian Festal Calendars. Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 2002. viii-132 p. 16 × 23. \$19.95

Clark, David K., *To Know and Love God*. Method for Theology (Foundations of Evangelical Theology). Wheaton, Illinois, Crossway Books, 2003. 464 p. 14 × 23. \$35.00

Cohen, Menachem (ed.), *Mikra'ot Gedolot 'Haketer'*. A revised and augmented scientific edition of 'Mikra'ot Gedolot' based on the Aleppo Codex and early Medieval MSS. Psalms, Part II. Ramat Gan, Bar-Ilan University Press, 2003. viii-246 p. 23,5 × 30,5

Cohen, Menahem, *Mikraot Gedolot "HaKeter": Psalms, Part I*. A revised and augmented scientific edition of 'Mikraot Gedolot' based on the Aleppo Codex and early Medieval MSS. Ramat-Gan, Bar-Ilan University, 2003. xlv-224 p. 23,5 × 30,5

Cotter, David W., O.S.B., *Genesis* (Berit Olam, Studies in Hebrew Narrative & Poetry). Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 2003. xxxviii-366 p. 16 × 23,5. \$49.95

Mayes, A. D. H. – Salters, R. B. (eds.), *Covenant as Context*. Essays in Honour of E. W. Nicholson. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2003. xl-426 p. 14 × 22. €70.00

Mies, Françoise (éd.), *Bible et économie*. Servir Dieu ou l'argent. Namur, Presses Universitaires de Namur – Bruxelles, Éditions Lessius, 2003. 171 p. 14 × 20,5

Nodet, Étienne, o. p., *Histoire de Jésus? Nécessité et limites d'une enquête* (Lire la Bible 135). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2003. xxiii-248 p. 13,5 × 21,5. €19,00

Odell-Scott, David W., *Paul's Critique of Theocracy*. A/Theocracy in Corinthians and Galatians (JSNTSS 250, Playing the Texts 8). London – New York, T & T Clark International, 2003. x-187 p. 16 × 24. €65,00

Le Pentateuque. Les cinq livres de la Loi. Traduction œcuménique de la Bible. Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf – Villiers-Le-Bel, Société Biblique Française, 2003. 411 p. 17 × 23. €23,00

Peri, Chiara, *Il regno del nemico*. La morte nella religione di Canaan (Studi biblici 140). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 2003. 245 p. 13,5 × 21. €20,80

Petersen, John, *Reading Women's Stories*. Female Characters in the Hebrew Bible. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2004. 226 p. 14 × 21,5. \$22,00

Pettinato, Giovanni (a cura di), *I miti degli inferi assiro-babilonesi* (Testi del Vicino Oriente antico 2; Letterature mesopotamiche 6). Brescia, Paideia Editrice, 2003. 183 p. 13,5 × 21. €21,60

Piñero, Antonio – **Peláez**, Jesús, *The Study of the New Testament*. A Comprehensive Introduction (Tools for Biblical Study 3). Leiden, Deo Publishing, 2003. xxii-579 p. 16 × 24. €32,95

Piper, John – **Taylor**, Justin – **Helseth**, Paul Kjos (eds.), *Beyond the Bounds*. Open Theism and the Undermining of Biblical Christianity. Wheaton, Illinois, Crossway Books, 2003. 416 p. 14 × 21,5. \$15,99

Pleins, J. David, *When the Great Abyss Opened*. Classic and Contemporary Readings of Noah's Flood. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2003. xiv-214 p. 16 × 24. €20,00

Poffet, Jean-Michel, *Heureux l'homme*. La sagesse chrétienne à l'école du psaume 1 (Épiphanie). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2003. 107 p. 13,5 × 19,5. €14,00

ISSN 0006-0887

This periodical is indexed in the ATLA Religion Database, published by the American Theological Library Association, 250 S. Wacker Dr., 16th Flr., Chicago, IL 60606.

E-mail: atla@atla.com. <http://www.atla.com/>

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa



Associato all'Unione Stampa Periodica Italiana

Finito di stampare il 19 aprile 2004

Tip.: Ist. Salesiano Pio XI - Via Umbertide, 11 - 00181 Roma